THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. V SEPTEMBER, 1922 No. 27

EDITORIAL

The papers here published were written for, and read at, the Anglo-Catholic Congress held at Leeds last June. They are not a complete record of the proceedings, partly because a number of subjects were dealt with in addresses delivered extempore or from notes,* and partly because no words could communicate the atmosphere of thoughtful and disciplined devotion, which found expression in great acts of Eucharistic worship on the first and third days and gave tone to the whole Congress. Even as it is, we have had greatly to increase our usual size. But this we gladly do in order to secure as typical a representation as circumstances permit of the spirit and mind underlying the movement.

We take this opportunity of expressing our best thanks to the Rev. Percy Browning, the Secretary of the Congress, for his help in collecting the papers. The welcome extended to visitors by all those responsible for its organization will not readily be forgotten.

* Such were the addresses of the Rev. J. C. How and W. E. Kemp on "Christ in the Church"; of the Rev. J. S. L. Burn and C. G. Biddle on "Christ and our Worship"; of Dr. Frere and Father Timothy Rees on "Christ and Society." These were fully reported in the *Church Times* for June 23rd and 30th. So, too, was the Bishop of Carlisle's opening sermon.

THE GOSPEL AND THE CREED*

"THE purpose and aim of this Congress is," according to the statement on the front page of its programme, "to extend the knowledge of Catholic faith and practice at home and abroad, and, by this means, to bring men and women to a true realization of our Lord Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour and King." The ultimate purpose here stated is one with which every Christian man must have sympathy: and it appeals with special force to members of the Church of England, as it combines in its purview the evangelical message of salvation through Christ, and the reference to Catholic faith and practice. I do not think, therefore, that I need, in any way, to apologize for my presence here to-day: though I am, of course, aware that some, perhaps many, of those here present may support beliefs and practices which do not seem to me to be either rightly described as Catholic or capable intrinsically of valid defence. I could not, for instance, accept many of the statements in the handbook, under the head "Misunderstood Subjects." I do hold, and in this I understand that we are all likely to be agreed here;—I think it will become increasingly manifest throughout Christendom—that the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of man, which is the divine answer to the doubts and hopes of men, will make firm and stable progress when it is presented by a society, "perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment," "speaking the same thing." The Gospel makes its appeal as a faith, not only as a life: and either without the other, though it may perform part of the work laid by Christ upon His followers, must always fall short of what Christ's Church may rightly be expected to do.

Our subject to-day is the Gospel and the Creed, and I am glad to have the opportunity of addressing some remarks to you on this head, for it is one upon which there is much discussion. Many questions are involved, and I cannot treat of them all. But I wish to say a few words upon a matter which seems to me of vital importance at the present time—the function of a definite faith, expressible in definite terms in the shape of a creed, in the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ.

There has been, as we all know, a prevalent notion that Christianity needs no positive doctrine—no dogma. Its functions are fulfilled if men are virtuous and charitable, and when that is so, it does not matter much what they believe. I greatly

* This paper has also been published separately. (Milford. 1s.)

hope that this theory of religion is gradually dying of inanition. Christianity has always been, when it is at its best, a missionary religion; it is hard to imagine a more futile programme for missionary work than a Gospel, so-called, without a creed. It is merely homiletic, when it ought to inspire with new force and enthusiasm; and it leaves all the real problems of nature and life and religion out of account. The hope of reunion, which has been seriously delayed by the prevalence of such notions as these, will probably extinguish them finally, now that the task of finding an agreed basis of union has been at last taken up with determination and goodwill.

I do not propose, therefore, to trouble you with arguments in favour of the profession by a missionary body of a definite form of belief. The point to which it seems to me more immediately necessary to direct our attention is one which comes to us from the side of historical criticism. What we are now told is, in effect, that the Creeds themselves as we have them are a spurious accretion to the original content of the Christian faith, to be accounted for by the influence of non-Christian influences acting upon the minds of those who preached the Gospel first, and then more extensively upon the growing Catholic Church. Two conspicuous cases of this external influence are said to be Greek philosophy and the mystery-religions. Of these, the second concerns more directly the sacraments and the doctrine connected with them. I am for the present more particularly considering the Creeds, and I have, therefore, to deal primarily with the influence of Greek philosophical thought.

In order to deal with this subject as clearly as I can in the brief time possible now, I will ask you to consider for a few moments one of our present Creeds somewhat carefully. I do not choose the *Quicunque vult*, partly because this document does not cover the whole ground of the Creed—it says nothing of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit—partly because it differs in history and style and usage from the other two. I select rather the Nicene Creed, so-called, because that is used both by the Eastern and Western Churches, and because, from the present point of view, anything that may be said of it is true *a fortiori* of the Apostles' Creed.

If, then, we turn to the Nicene Creed, we find that it falls into three paragraphs. The first deals very shortly with the doctrine of the Father, and affirms the creation of the world by Him. Strictly speaking, this is, or involves, a metaphysical doctrine; no one, for instance, who held a purely materialistic view of the world could accept this article of the Creed. But the appearance of the word Father removes even this article from the region of pure metaphysic and connects it with the

teaching of our Lord. In the second paragraph we have the doctrine of the Son, and of His manifestation in the Incarnation, and of His Second Coming. In the third paragraph there is a brief statement of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; and there is added a reference to the Church, to Baptism, and to the Christian hope after death.

It is of the utmost importance to notice that in all this there is only one word which travels definitely outside the vocabulary of Scripture, and that is ὁμοούσιον. It is true, of course, that those who drew up the Creed, and those who have defended it since, use of necessity the language of philosophy, because all theological belief involves—as I have just pointed out—a scheme of thought which affects and is affected by other ideas and convictions. But it is noticeable that these philosophical arguments are not included in the Creed. There is not even an indication of the meaning of οὐσία implied in the word ὁμοούσιον. This is a point of some importance, and, in order to illustrate it, I will ask your attention for a few moments to certain passages from St. Athanasius. As you are aware, he was not a member of the Council of Nicæa, being in deacon's orders only; but he was in attendance upon the Patriarch of Alexandria, and, being already a theologian of high eminence, was consulted informally on the questions in dispute. About the year 352 he wrote a book *De Decretis Nicænæ Synodi*. This was intended to defend the Council against criticism based on its use of the expressions ὁμοούσιον and ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός. In Chapter I. he tells us that persons have asked the question, "Why did those who met at Nicæa use unscriptural phrases (ἀγράφους λέξεις) ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιον?" He discusses at considerable length the actual problem before the Council, and gives his answer to the above question as follows (Chapter XX.): "The Bishops . . . were compelled to collect again the sense out of the Scriptures, and to state again more clearly what they said before, and to write that the Son was of one substance with the Father." "If then (Chapter XXI.) [the Arians] refuse the terms on the pretence that they are strange, let them reflect upon the sense in which the Council used them, anathematizing what the Council anathematized, and then, if they can, let them find fault with the phraseology. . . . If they blame the sense, it is plain to all that they are talking idly about the wording, and using it as a starting-point for their impiety. . . . Let any studious person perceive that even if the phrases are not in so many words in the Scriptures, yet they carry the sense of the Scriptures, and by giving expression to this they declare it to those whose hearing is sound towards piety." Athanasius then considers various

erroneous inferences which may be drawn from the term οὐσία, and from the use of such phrases as "Father" to describe God. Then he writes (Chapter XXII.): "Even though it be impossible to comprehend what the substance (οὐσία) of God may be, yet if we perceive that God is, and if the Scripture describes Him in these terms, we merely wish to describe none other than Himself when we speak of God as Father and Lord. . . . So let no one feel startled if he hears that the Son of God is of the essence of God, but rather admit that the Fathers, clearing up the sense, wrote more plainly, but as it were in equivalent phrases, "from God," "from the substance of God." They thought that it meant exactly the same to say that the Son was ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, and that He was ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. The former phrase runs back upon John xvi. 28; the meaning of the other is determined by the first." In another place in the same book (Chapter XXXI.) Athanasius lays emphasis upon the superiority of Scriptural phraseology over that of "the Greeks." "We can indicate the [nature of] God better and more truly by means of the Son and by calling Him Father, than by naming Him by means of His works alone and calling Him Ingenerate. The latter points to the works created by Him by means of the Word: the name of Father calls attention to the unique generation from His substance. And as the Word is superior to created things, so and more truly will it be better to speak of God as Father than as Ingenerate. The latter word is unscriptural and suspect, and has many meanings; the former is simple and Scriptural and truer, and points only to the Son. The term Ingenerate was devised by Greeks who know not the Son; the term Father was recognized by our Lord (ἐγνώσθη παρὰ) and has been given [to us] as a gift (κεχάρισται)."

It is plain from these passages, and many others could be quoted from the *De Decretis* and other works, that Athanasius conceives the function of the Council to be to interpret and to protect the Scripture, and to prevent its teaching being gradually changed by the intrusion of alien and incompatible ideas. The meaning of the Scripture is the main test of what is true, and it is supported, so he would contend, by the utterances of distinguished theologians in the past (*De Decretis*, 25 *ff.*). It is not, I think, possible to maintain that Athanasius was trying to translate Christian doctrine into philosophical language; he is guided throughout by Scripture, and he brings all the phraseology to that test. We should not always, perhaps should not often, accept his interpretation of the text, especially in the Old Testament; but I think it is impossible to avoid the impression that his object is interpretation and not speculation.

The evidence of Athanasius shows, I think, what the Church

had in view in its use of the word ὁμοούσιον. As I have already observed, the rest of the Creed is entirely within the language of Holy Scripture. It describes in its second paragraph the salient facts in the Life of our Lord, His Resurrection and Ascension; and in this it simply summarizes the account of Him which stands in the New Testament. It is of great importance to note that all these statements are historical in character; they affirm the occurrence of certain events, and perhaps it is not too much to say that, if they are true, the account of our Lord in the earlier part of the second paragraph is natural enough. It is at this point that we have to consider a particular line of criticism. Many writers would admit that the Nicene statement is organically continuous with ideas already present in the New Testament, and would acknowledge that they must search there for the beginnings of the Hellenization, which in their view characterizes Catholic doctrine. In days when the books of the New Testament were placed at a considerable distance from the date of our Lord's life, this was easier than it is now, as there was a considerable time given in which the process of Hellenization could take place. But we are still in presence of a theory of this sort, and the points to which I propose to refer briefly in regard to it are the two following: By means of analysis of the Gospels it is attempted to disentangle the nucleus of historic fact which underlies them: this is called the search for the "Jesus of history." The influence of Greek philosophy and mystery-religions is then sought to be traced in the writings of St. Paul and St. John, such terms as the λόγος, and the language used in 1 Cor. about the Eucharist being assigned to these sources. To discuss these positions with any degree of adequacy would require a long and technical treatise, and this is not the occasion for attempting anything of this sort. All I can do now is to lay before you what are the general results of my own study of these matters, which has been in process for many years.

1. What I have said about Athanasius is, *mutatis mutandis*, true of the writers in the New Testament. It is undeniable that words and phrases occur in them for which it is easy to find parallels in pagan writers, religious and philosophical. But it is not enough to find words and phrases. In their non-Christian use these words belong to a system of ideas, and I venture to think that it is impossible to prove the presence of this system of ideas in the Pauline and Johannine writings. The thought in these, however near their phraseology may occasionally appear to Hellenic thought, goes back not to this, but to the much less articulate and reasoned thought of the Hebrew Scriptures.

2. I do not quarrel with the attempt to disentangle the Jesus of history from the existing records. But I think we have a right to ask that the figure which results should account for the existence of the Church and the development of its thought and practice. I venture to think that this condition is not fulfilled. There is one fact written large over the New Testament as a whole, which is that the new movement in religion, whatever it was, dated from the presence in the world of Jesus Christ. None of those to whom it fell to spread the movement were in the smallest doubt about this. St. Paul was not a man to accept dictation or to conceal his own part in the movement; but, though he tells us nothing new of the life of the Lord, there is no doubt that his whole mind and will are prostrate in abasement before the Lord. The same is true of the other New Testament writers; there is not the slightest vestige of a suggestion that any of them were acting in any other capacity than as servants of His. It is difficult to see how, if Christ were merely a prophet of the Second Coming with an "interim ethic," if He were merely a preacher of righteousness and charity, with no message of salvation, if He had succeeded after His death in convincing His followers of immortality, but did not rise from the grave—it is difficult to see how His followers can have held and retained the opinion of Him which they express in their works. For it must be remembered always that the Second Coming did not take place; the preaching of righteousness did not keep sin out of the infant Church; Christian people, as the Thessalonians noted to their great perplexity, died like other men in spite of the new life. If the followers of Jesus got their positive doctrines about His nature and functions from Greek philosophy and mystery-religions, it is hard to understand why they should have continued to preach these things as part of the message of Christ, when their experience showed them that the course of the Church was going to be very different indeed from what they had grounds for supposing. All that they believed or taught seemed to them to date back to their knowledge of Him: they were witnesses of what He was and did. Of course, it is difficult for evolutionary minds to understand how such tremendous changes can have come about through the activities of one Teacher; we naturally try to bridge over the change by imagining a series of almost imperceptible steps. But it seems to me that it is a mistake to suppose that evolution excludes catastrophic changes in history, especially in the spiritual history of man. Look, for instance, at the forty volumes or so of J. S. Bach's music. You can study these, and go back behind them to various predecessors and see how in various ways characteristics of Bach were

anticipated. But there is no unbroken passage from the predecessors to Bach. If you had mastered all that Heinrich Schütz and Pachelbel and Buxtehude could teach you, you would still be in the presence of a great fixed gulf, which Bach alone could cross. It is the same with the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. More than almost any other poem, that work is the happy hunting-ground of scholars, busily tracing its "origins" in the history and philosophy and poetry of the day. But the *Summa* of St. Thomas, and the *Speculum* of Vincentius of Beauvais, and all the early Italian poets put together will not give you the *Divina Commedia:* that is a different *thing* altogether. In like manner, I venture to think, you may study the Apocalypses and the mystery-religions and the current philosophy, and show, probably quite truly, how various elements in the doctrine of the New Testament fit on to elements in pre-Christian and non-Christian thought; but this will not explain the figure of Christ and the impression He made upon His followers. What is called the Jesus of history will not, I think, displace the Jesus of the New Testament—of the New Testament as a whole, and not merely of the Gospels.

You will think, I am afraid, that I have forgotten our purpose here to-day and the Anglo-Catholic Congress. What I have just said brings me back to it directly. I have ventured to suggest that the so-called Jesus of history when opposed to the Jesus of the New Testament is a fictitious figure, or perhaps, I should rather say, a theoretical expedient devised for the solution of a problem, and I think it fails, not because there is no problem, but because it never is solid and stable enough to bear the superstructure which, *ex hypothesi*, depends upon it. So far as we have gone, in other words, it has proved impossible to get behind the Jesus of the New Testament to anything adequate to account for the actual presentation of our Lord in those writings. I now want to go a step further, and suggest that you must be very careful in any efforts you may make towards distinguishing the Jesus of the New Testament from the Jesus of the Church. It is here, I think, that the Anglo-Catholic movement has a great part to play.

In spite of various authorship the books of the New Testament have a wonderful unity in idea. It is easy to distinguish the thought of St. Paul and that of St. John, but it is also inevitable that their agreements should emerge, under study, in a very striking fashion. Moreover, the books comprised in the New Testament have been for many centuries sharply distinguished from all others: a list or Canon was developed, and the books included in it were set in connection with the Old Testament Scriptures. And it can hardly be denied that

there is a difference between them and all other Christian literature. This difference, which all Christians admit, has been variously defined, and we are not concerned with these definitions now. But it is important to notice that the difference raises a very serious question. Assuming that it is possible to derive from the canonical books a coherent conception of Christ and His work, what is the position of the Church after the close of the Canon? Is Christianity like Judaism, after all, a religion of a book—in spite of St. Paul's antithesis between that which is written (τὸ γράμμα) and the Spirit? Or is the Spirit who guided the writing and selection of these books alive still in the Church, interpreting the book and guiding the Church to applications of the written word to new ages and circumstances and men? Unfortunately this is not a plain question, but, still more unfortunately, it is widely supposed that a plain answer can be given to it. It is widely held that there is an exhaustive alternative between the Bible and the Church: one or other may be—many would say must be—taken as the complete and final and infallible guide. It seems to me that both sides of this disjunction are inadequate to the facts: both alike aim at severing and treating in severance two parts of one single living whole. This is a mistake somewhat resembling that upon which I have already made some comment—the severance between the Jesus of history and the Jesus of the Church. It is true that there is—at any rate almost all Christians think so—a coherent conception of Christ and His work in Scripture; but it is not justifiable to set this in antagonism to the body through which the Scriptures themselves were selected and gathered together, as if it were an alien body with no continuity of mind and no unity of inspiration with the Scriptures. As I understand the matter, it is this principle of continuity in idea and inspiration which the Anglo-Catholic party has inherited through Tractarianism from the ancient Church, and for which it stands to-day. Anglo-Catholics maintain as truly as St. Peter that there is none other name under heaven except that of Jesus Christ whereby men may be saved. But they wish also to retain and to emphasize in various ways their retention of the consciousness of union with the whole spiritual Body of Christ throughout its history from the days of the Son of Man until now.

But at this point a new question arises, upon which I will venture to say a few words in conclusion. I have compared the attempt to disentangle the Jesus of history to the attempt to sever the Jesus of the New Testament from the Jesus of the Church. That these last are closely connected I have no doubt. But there is an important difference between the two cases.

If I am right in thinking that the various conjectural pictures of the Jesus of history fail to achieve their purpose, we are left with the character set forth in the New Testament and with that alone. But if we are also right in condemning the undue severance of the Bible and the Church, are we bound to all that has been asserted in the name of the Church as regards our Lord, and all the inferences that have been based upon His life and work? I think not. The history of the Church covers many centuries, and it has been chequered by controversy, discussion, and schism. Doubtless there has been continuous development, but there have also been heresies and accretions which have no true place in the line. Everyone who has studied Church history knows the complexity of the problems raised in it. Might we, perhaps, put our question in a rather different form? Is there any limit to the range of authority? Are there any propositions, short of self-contradiction, which no authority can make credible? I think there are such propositions, and they are of two kinds: one kind belongs to the region of history, the other to that of metaphysic. I can make my meaning most clear by taking instances, and for these I will go back to the Nicene Creed, from which I began. This Creed asserts that our Lord Jesus Christ . . . was Incarnate of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and that He ascended into heaven. Anyone may say that these two statements are *a priori* impossible, or that the historical evidence is against them. The Church maintains that they are not impossible, that the assertion of them rests upon adequate historical evidence, and that they are part of its continuous witness. Some centuries later it was asserted that the Blessed Virgin was immaculately conceived, and was received into heaven by an assumption. There may be *a priori* reasons for believing these things, but they do not prove the facts: there is no historical evidence worth serious consideration. I would venture to assert, therefore, that no authority, however venerable, could make these assertions as to the Blessed Virgin Mary rationally credible. In the Nicene Creed it is asserted that the Son is of one substance with the Father. I have tried to show that no *theory* of substance is here involved; and I should further maintain that no authority is adequate to define and impose a theory of substance, either in regard to the Incarnation or in regard to the Eucharist, and that, therefore, all theoretical expositions or practices in regard to the Eucharist which depend upon a theory of substance have no validity, however venerable the authority which promulgates them.

The history of the Church is chequered: it has amply fulfilled the forebodings of St. Paul; and for this reason, while we claim

our place in the succession of Christian thought, we cannot bind ourselves blindly to everything which has been held by venerable authority. The New Testament claims a unique authority, because without it we have no means whatever of knowing anything about the founder of our religion: all our knowledge, and the primary content of the witness of the Church is there. Nothing else stands quite in this position. In the subsequent period the development of heresy, of controversy, and schism places us in a different position. We have to work out for our own times and in the light of the history of the Church the real meaning for to-day of the original witness. It is here, I think, that the Anglo-Catholic requires the help of the Modernist. He wants to be able to go freely to the history of the Church, and to study freely the development of its doctrine and practice. The Church of England has many difficulties, but it has some peculiar advantages. Owing to its special history, it can approach questions of doctrine and practice without being crushed by the weight of a tradition, such as that of the Eastern Church, which has not for very many centuries had to face the blast of new thought and criticism. It is free, also, without for a moment denying or attenuating the truth of the Christian religion, to adopt a more liberal conception of the nature of truth and the method of approaching it than is compatible with the Roman claims. So far from disparaging the Nicene Creed, I think we want to study more carefully its method and principles, and to remember that many years passed after its formulation before its authority was recognized by the whole Church. I think the Fathers of Nicæa were wiser and more subtle than many of their critics: they reasserted, but they did not venture to add to the contents of the witness of the Church; they protected the deposit of the Faith by adopting one extra-scriptural word, but they made no attempt to tie up the Church to any system of metaphysical thought.

THOMAS RIPON.

THE SUPERNATURAL

THE Supernatural is a term full of challenge to the modern world; and it may serve to clear the ground for positive exposition of this fundamental concept of the Catholic faith if we try to explain first what we do not mean by it, and why we use it. There are two types of belief and outlook for which misunderstanding of our position is especially easy: we may call them respectively Naturalism and Spiritualism. To both of them

the idea of the Supernatural represents something confused, if not perverse, in thought; and as between them they cover the working opinions of almost all thoughtful people who are not, in the Christian sense of the word, believers in God—as, moreover, the doctrine of the Supernatural touches them both at a variety of points, we may well try to stake out its place as against these two philosophies first of all.

Naturalism may be described as the doctrine or habit of mind according to which truth is ascertainable by the empirical methods of the natural sciences alone, and beyond these limits nothing is or can be known. Nature, on this basis, is conceived of as an interrelated system of causes and effects, operative in infinite space and time; and so compact and closed is the system that, had we sufficient knowledge of it as it is to-day, we could predict all future events which can ever happen. Of late years the net of the formula has been thrown wide enough to include psychology, but this extension only serves to illustrate the strait-waistcoat in which it really functions; for while all phenomena of the mind are grist to psychology's mill, it is not, as such, concerned with the question of whether or not there is a soul. As against this philosophy, the doctrine of the Supernatural asserts that the level of reality dealt with by the natural sciences is not the only nor the chief one, but that through and beyond it there are deeper levels apprehended by other methods and kinds of experience—by the æsthetic activity, by the moral consciousness, by intuitive reason and dialectic, and finally by that range of experiences which we call specifically "religious." It is to connote this distinct level of reality with its correspondingly distinct type of experience that we speak of the Supernatural. A dominant feature of this experience is that the objects revealed in it are revealed only to faith. Flesh and blood can reveal to us Nature; Supernature is revealed only by our Father in heaven, who gives us the light of faith. But we assert most emphatically that the two orders of Nature and Supernature are of one and the same Creator and Lord of all, and that conflict arises between them only because man will have it so. We believe "that the spiritual values which faith envisages as its ideal are also the forces which hold the world together; that no limits can be set to the degree in which what we call nature is eventually capable of being moulded in response to them."* We are no Marcionites; and none can look forward more eagerly than we to the day when science shall have so enlarged its conception of nature as to recognize the transcendent levels, and, because of their primacy, to acknowledge once again theology as "the queen of the

* A. C. Turner, in *Concerning Prayer*, pp. 398-9.

sciences." For such acknowledgment will carry with it also an implicit condemnation of one of the most formidable popular errors of our time—the belief that in conduct the lower life alone is "natural" to men, and that the higher life of moral effort and self-control is unnatural and a kind of fad.

Spiritualism is a term which is used in a broader, and in a more special, sense. In the broader sense it embraces the views of all those who regard the world as the expression of Absolute Spirit. It is thus in contrast with both Materialism and Vitalism, which find Matter and Life respectively as the ultimate principle of Nature. Since, therefore, Christian Theism is a form of Spiritualism, it may be asked why we do not speak of the Spiritual rather than the Supernatural. The reason is that we desire to distinguish our position as clearly as possible from Spiritual Monism or Pantheism, of which the Stoics in ancient times, and Spinoza and Christian Science in more recent days, may be regarded as the chief representatives. We find very little value in a conception of Eternal or Divine Spirit, which has no place for the significant attributes of Personality and Freedom. As William James says, "the world interpreted religiously is not the materialistic world over again, with an altered expression; it must have, over and above the altered expression, *a natural constitution* different at some point from that which a materialistic world would have. It must be such that different events can be expected in it, different conduct must be required. . . . It is only transcendentalist metaphysicians who think that, without adding concrete details to Nature, or subtracting any, but by simply calling it the expression of absolute spirit, you make it more divine just as it stands."* Christianity, witnessing to God as Love and interpreting His Omnipotence as meaning that there are no situations which Love is not capable of meeting and of meeting victoriously, parts here decisively with Monism. And we speak of the Supernatural rather than of the Spiritual precisely because we desire to emphasize the reality and the autonomy of the spiritual order, and to avoid a term which can be taken as connoting no more than a quality or colour inherent, whether in the sum of things or in particular minds and dispositions. In other words, we are dealing not with an adjective, but with the most intensely concrete substance.

When we come to Spiritualism in the special sense of belief in contact with the souls of the departed by means of spiritualistic séances and so forth, we have to guard against misunderstanding of another kind. For in popular parlance the Supernatural is often used to signify just these kinds of

* *Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 518*f*.

experience and nothing more. Here our problem as Catholic Christians is different. Hitherto we have been vindicating the necessity of employing this concept as against those who would deny its validity. Now we have to make good our claim as against those who use it, but use it only to abuse it; and our task is like that of the second-century Church in its conflict with the Christian gnostics. And here I do not know that, as Christians, we have anything to say as to whether or not the communications supposed to be given in these experiences are or are not veridical: that question may safely be left to the Society for Psychical Research. But granted that they are veridical—and I should not be prepared to deny that assumption in certain cases—they are emphatically not supernatural. The whole picture of the realm of the departed presented by such writers as Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is of a condition of life natural at every point. It is the picture of a Limbo analogous to the limbos of Homer, of Virgil, of the ancient Hebrews. Such a prolongation of the conditions and circumstances of the natural life as Limbo implies is not inconceivable, nor does it seem to be inconsistent with the Christian Faith. Only let us be under no delusions as to what is offered. Just as this realm cannot be called supernatural, because no faith is required for its apprehension, so, too, its apprehension cannot bring to a believing, supernaturally-awakened soul, any the least gift of consolation. On the contrary, its message is one of infinite disappointment. What we desire and pray for on behalf of our beloved departed is that Supernature, not Nature, should be more and more controlling and conditioning their lives; that the petty tasks, foibles, self-centred habits of the natural life should be left behind, as they enter on the purgative way of ever-deepening surrender to the Spirit; and that God's grace, fulfilling even the most faint and faltering motions of faith active in this life here, should take occasion from death to give a new and certain direction to their souls' progress. The Spiritualists would do well to realize that, in discovering Limbo, they are narrowing the bounds of hope and giving vivid point to the old Preacher's saying, "He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow."*

Let us come now to the pith of our argument. For convenience we may distinguish three stages of intensity and richness in which the Supernatural reveals itself in experience. There is first the stage in which it reveals itself as a gracious and constraining Reality amid the variety of helps or obstacles which make up the facts of life. It is gracious, we say, because, to a higher degree than any of the bounties and beauties of

* Eccles. i. 18.

external Nature, or even of the tender greetings of human love, it convinces us as being supremely the Given. We do not find it, but it finds us; we do not know it, but are known of it; we do not apprehend it, but are apprehended of it. And it is constraining, because we have to bow to it. Its still, small voice speaks with an authority more urgent than is ever heard in the " great and strong " wind or in the earthquake or in the fire. It claims and elicits our surrender. " Wheresoever," says a great Catholic writer,* " there are acts, experiences, necessities of sheer self-surrender, in the deepest search and work within the visible and temporal, the contingent and relative, to the Invisible, the Eternal, and the Unconditional; wheresoever such self-surrender is from those temporalities, apprehended as such, to these Eternities, accepted, adored, as such: there is the Supernatural."

This stage of revelation in experience of " the Transcendent become Immanent to our human world " has its own peculiar prophets and seers. They are the poets and the artists of mankind. The tragic sequence of Satiety (κόρος), Pride (ὕβρις), and Fate (ἄτη) which forms the central *motif* of Æschylean tragedy; the consciousness of supernatural guidance which suddenly nerves the blind footsteps of Œdipus, as he makes his last exit in the play of Sophocles; the rôle of Anchises in the 6th Æneid and of Beatrice in the *Divine Comedy*—what are these but symbols of the Supernatural in experience ? Or how account else for the sweet grace of chivalry in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, for Shakespeare with his *Tempest* and *King Lear*, for the frenzied sculpture of Michelangelo, for Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus ?* And the tradition has never died. When Henry Vaughan saw

> " through all this human dress
> Bright shoots of everlastingness "—

when Blake cried:

> " Kill not the Moth nor Butterfly,
> For the Last Judgment draweth nigh "—

when Shelley, the rebel and the atheist, sang:

> " It seem'd as if the hour were one
> Sent from beyond the skies,
> Which scatter'd from above the sun
> A light from Paradise "—

when Wordsworth, telling in *Tintern Abbey* how the loss of the days when nature to him " was all in all " has been compensated, bears witness to

* Baron von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses*, etc., p. 198.

> " A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts: a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things "—

when Matthew Arnold, so critical as he was of the Catholic creed, tells of those moments when man's Buried Life emerges into consciousness,

> " And then he thinks he knows
> The hills where his life rose
> And the sea where it goes "

(an experience so abundantly illustrated in his own *Notebooks* published since his death)—then, in all these cases and a thousand others like them, we say that we find unmistakable evidences and intimations of what we mean by the Supernatural. Do not let us forget, or think lightly of, this great Church of the poets and artists. They and we are part of one congregation, one Church Invisible; and we ask them to pass on with us that they may see " greater works than these."

This second stage of the self-revelation of the Supernatural is reached when we come to the experience of the transcendent Reality as Personal. Jacob wrestling till the break of day; Samuel hearing his own voice called; the Three Children confident that their God would be able to deliver them from the furnace, but that, if not, they would still refuse to worship the golden image—these are characteristic records of this stage. Who that had not already prejudged the question could read a Psalm like the 139th and still maintain that what is here given is not the evidence of contact with a Personal God, but rather a form of auto-suggestion ? And the like dilemma is presented by the experiences of Prophecy and of Conversion. For Prophecy I cannot do better than refer to the masterly treatment of its evidential significance contained in Bishop Gore's great book, *Belief in God*—only adding that that significance is all the greater because the phenomenon does not stand by itself, but is part of a long tradition which affords many analogous experiences. The writings of the Prophets will always be one of the sheet-anchors of Theism. Here, with an unparalleled clearness and precision, that gracious and constraining Reality, revealed in all experience of the Supernatural, is known

as Universal Lord and Judge, Perfect in Righteousness, Purity, Wisdom, and Power.

Conversion is an experience of the Supernatural which involves very varying degrees of illumination. It may carry with it no more definite disclosure of the Supernatural than is described in the three great central chapters of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*. It may, as so often in the case of adolescents, be primarily concerned with a particular struggle in the moral life, the grace received being, so to speak, canalized in a particular direction. Or it may be of that overwhelmingly vivid and luminous type attested by prophets and mystics, of which St. Paul's conversion is a salient example. "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest"—that is the quintessence of the conversion-experience. Modern psychology has laid us under a great debt by its analysis of the mental mechanism operative in such experiences as this. Only let us not think that to understand the mechanism is to exhaust the significance of the fact. And the significance of the fact lies not only in the presence of the Supernatural in experience, but in the unveiling of what and who it is. It is Jesus. And just as on the first stage of revelation we joined hands with the poets and artists of all ages, so here we join hands with all those to whom our Saviour's Name sums up the whole of God, and who believe that in Him dwells all the Supernatural bodily. The whole work of the Church's pastoral ministry is to bring men and women and little children to Him. All that we experience or learn from others of Givenness, of Prevenient Grace, of Abiding Value and End, we recognize as finding its crown and true accomplishment and self-revelation in Christ. For "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us: and we beheld His glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

But there is yet a third stage; and we reach it when the Supernatural to which we give our homage is recognized not as "Jesus only," but as "Christ and His Church." St. Paul's conversion itself affords luminous testimony to this deepest apprehension of Reality. Just as the process of grace in his experience took its temporal origin, so far as we can judge, from the vision of Christ seen in the heavenward gaze of the first martyr, St. Stephen, so it was not completed, as the record of his blindness shows, until he had made his submission to a Christian, and been received into the Church by Ananias. It was the development of the implicates of this experience which made St. Paul the founder of Catholic theology. "There is one body, and one Spirit." In other words the Supernatural reveals itself in corporate as well as individual experience; it weaves itself into social history; it expresses itself in the outward

and visible order. Indeed, it is precisely in so far as it does this that we can have a rational knowledge of it in theology, and so commend it, not to this man or to that, but "to *every man's* conscience in the sight of God." Its institutional embodiment in Church, in Rite, and in Creed is the spear-point of its impact upon mankind as a whole.

1. Perhaps we may best grasp the significance of the Church if we compare for a moment on the quite external plane William James's classical work, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, with the Scriptures of the Church. For the Bible contains all and more of the different types of experience described in the pages of the philosopher. Yet why is the difference of impression made by the two records so immediately arresting? Surely the contrast lies just in this—still keeping to the external plane—that the most vivid individual experiences of the Supernatural are presented to us in the Bible as integrated with, absorbed into, and organically part of a continuous corporate experience, first of a tribe, then of a Chosen People, then of that new Race of the children of God who are born of water and the Spirit. Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah are the recipients of revelation not as individuals only, but as men of affairs; the glory of the Psalms is not what they tell us of the Psalmists, but what they tell us of the Church, which has used the Psalter as its hymn-book; nor can we understand the writings of the Apostles apart from the Society which found their experience repeated and their teachings verified in its own life. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Thanks be to God, we say, who measures not His mercies by man's ordering or man's intelligence. But thanks also to Him, in that He does not allow us to think of His gifts as anything fortuitous or fantastic, but has given us in historical revelation the record of how the human mind, working corporately over long reaches of time and amid the most diverse vicissitudes of fortune, attained and attains to an ever fuller understanding of the Supernatural revealed in experience.

2. The pledges and sureties of this action of the Divine Spirit on and in the Body Corporate are the Sacraments. No more than any other activity of social life can religion function without the aid and use of objects belonging to the external order. It uses them, in their several modes and capacities of symbolism, as the *foci* of the Supernatural. This could not be, certainly, but for that interfusion and interaction of the Supernatural with the Natural, alike in the visible order and in the spirit of man, of which we have already spoken. But, because

of that, Sacraments become the necessary and normal channels of God's grace; the sacred elements receiving, by His Will, properties whether of doing (as in Baptism or Unction), or of being as well as doing (as in the Holy Eucharist), which make them the *media* of the Supernatural. If we claim the latter as the central act of every Sunday's worship, it is because only so can the specifically Christian emotions be awakened, the full richness of supernatural experience be mediated, and the simple but majestic message of the Gospel be brought home.

When we speak of the Sacraments, we are moving on the border-line between the Supernatural as such and the Miraculous. I say the border-line; for while in Sacraments the Spirit functions in and upon the visible and external, it does not yet flow over to facts or happenings which appear contrary to the known order of Nature. But that such overflow does occur we, as Catholics, do not doubt; and no account of the Supernatural would be complete without allusion to Miracle. And here I think we may do much to remove misunderstanding, if we use the metaphor of " overflow " rather than of " breach " or of " interposition." The idea of " breach " in the natural order presents the reason with a surd; while the category of " interposition " tells us little, seeing that we believe in the constant and regular interposition of the Supernatural in human experience. The standpoint, then, from which I will ask you to approach the Miraculous is that which underlies the whole of this paper—the belief, namely, that there is an impact in experience of the Divine Spirit upon the human spirit. In many ways this impact resembles that of one human spirit upon another—as we know it in love, for example, or in leadership, or in those more mysterious, but perfectly well authenticated, phenomena of telepathy or of suggestion. Furthermore, the recent practice and science of psychotherapy or mental healing are familiarizing us with the notion that this impact of one human spirit upon another may overflow from the spirit to the body of the patient. Again, the body, we know, is bound by the subtlest, yet most substantial, ties with the whole of its physical and material surroundings. May we not say that in what we call Miracle there is just such an overflow, the urgency of the Divine Spirit upon the human extending its energy not only to the body immediately proper to that incarnate, human spirit, but also to the material environment surrounding it ?

Such a view would involve our saying that in Miracle the Supernatural always employs the mediation of human, or at least of incarnate, spirit. I do not think that we need shirk such a conclusion: and indeed there is much in Catholic belief and practice which sustains it. Though it is true that, strictly

speaking, there are only two or three miraculous events which are *de fide* for the Church—those, namely, contained in the Creed—yet Catholicism has always felt itself committed to a general acceptance of the miraculous beyond the limits not only of the Creed, but even of the New Testament as well. It always insists, in short, that the age of Miracles is not past. Again, if we consider a particular Miracle such as the Virgin Birth, it is significant that Christian art, and its sister, popular devotion, have never willingly isolated this event from the personality of Mary. The Nativity, that is to say—as in St. Luke's Gospel—is always closely conjoined with the Annunciation, the Incarnation with the praises of Mary. Both the Gospel evidence and the later instinct of the Church would seem to suggest that the human spirit of the Mother fulfils a vital function in the miraculous process. Further, our Lord Himself bears witness to a similar necessary interaction of the human spirit, when at Nazareth " He could do no mighty work, because of their unbelief."

Such a view of Miracle, while it appears to meet all legitimate objections from the side of Natural Science, yet sacrifices nothing of its evidential value. Rather, indeed, it enhances it. For it sets the miraculous in line with something not outside human experience, but within it, although transcending it; and at the same time still confronts the Reason with a challenging fact, and stirs it to enquire why this or that particular happening occurred as it did, and what is its significance.

3. This impact of the Supernatural on and in the Christian community, which finds institutional embodiment in the history of the Church and in its Worship, gives rise to, as it also verifies, those great affirmations which constitute the *schema* of Catholic dogma. A French writer has said that " doctrinal unity is the permanent miracle of the Church." This is the more remarkable, when we reflect that the Faith is no cast-iron structure, but dynamic and organic, assimilating all that is best in the thought of each age, throwing out new formulations to meet fresh ranges of experience, adapting its terminology to the changing demands of different races and ages. In its best periods Catholic theology, like other traditions of science, is never modernist, because it is resolutely modern. There are some who think to come to terms with the world by sacrificing Catholic dogma. They may do so, but the terms will be terms of surrender; and what they will forfeit will be the experience of the Supernatural. More than once in the early and in later centuries the great majority of the Church have forgotten the Rock whence they were hewn, and have relapsed over long periods of time into one form of Rationalism or another. But

again and again, too, the instancy of the Divine Spirit has made itself felt—in strange lives passed in caves and deserts, in the homes of the poor and the sick, in the hearts of kings—and recalled men to the Faith of their fathers. When this has happened, revival has meant fresh claims and successful claims upon the intellectual allegiance of men. Who knows if to-day God is not preparing some such issue for our generation ?

Meanwhile His Love and Grace urge us to show forth the Supernatural where and as each of us can in daily life. "If any man willeth to do the will of My Father which is in heaven, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." It is by showing forth "the fruits of the Spirit" that we bring men to the experience of the Spirit Himself. There, in the lives of the Saints, we can trace the footprints of God all down the devious ways of human story; and it is their fellowship that makes us brave. I think of one, known to many here, whose home was at Burley-in-Wharfedale—a lady whose frail body was chronically racked with pain, yet whose soul was undaunted to the last, and her brain unflagging. Throughout the war she corresponded regularly with scores of her fellow-townsmen—lads, many of them, whom she herself had taught in class. Student and lover of letters as she was, no one could be a better companion; and all her suffering was turned to unselfishness and sympathy, and that joyfulness which consorts with sense of humour. There is the Supernatural. Again, I think of a grave on the eastern bank of the Monticano in Italy. He was the sanitary man of the 8th Battalion of the Yorkshire Regiment—a man of forty-five with a family at home. He insisted, against all protests, that the battalion should not go into action without him; and he fell in the last hour's fighting on that front, in the very van of the attack. There, too, is the Supernatural. Once more—and to conclude—I recall a celebration of the Holy Communion in an Italian village one Sunday morning, to which officers and men of the Duke of Wellington's regiment were gathered. Among them was a Company Sergeant-Major whose quiet devotion seemed to uplift us all. He had been with the battalion since its first landing in France; and there had not been a Sunday during those three years and more when, if duty permitted, he had not made his Communion. There, yet again, is the Supernatural.

Truly, the Lord's arm is not shortened that He cannot save.

E. G. Selwyn.

THE PERSON OF OUR LORD

It is the Christian contention that Christianity is the absolute religion. It is a contention with a double implication, that, on the one hand, there can be no true development of religion which will leave Christianity behind as a creed and life that has served many generations, but is, for all that, merely a stepping-stone on the road to a more perfect religion in the future; on the other, that Christianity contains within itself all the potency for satisfying the religious needs of humanity in the fullness of their varied characteristics. It is not at all necessary to argue that the whole splendour of Christianity as the absolute religion has already been revealed; on the contrary, we can apply yet more widely and richly those fine and believing words which the old Pilgrim Father, John Robinson, spoke in reference to the Holy Scriptures: "The Lord hath yet more light and truth to break forth from His Holy Word"; but we are committed to the faith that the Word of God, which is the Gospel, will never be refined or sublimated into something that transcends our Christian understanding of it. Christianity is not one of

> the great world's altar-stairs
> That slope thro' darkness up to God.

It is the altar, the only true and perfect one. If a good example is required of what Dr. Liddon called the "Inspiration of Selection," though applied not to the contents of a Biblical book, but to its place in the New Testament Canon, there is none better than the Epistle to the Hebrews. How great would have been our loss if the doubts which prevailed in the West as to that book had had their way and it had never taken its place alongside of the other New Testament Epistles! For in that letter the whole idea of the finality of Christianity is present and in control. It was intended to prevent some little community of perplexed Christians from slipping back to the preparatory, imperfect, typical level of Judaism. But the writer gives us something far more and grander than the answer to a particular emergency. What Stephen was trying to do when they broke in on his unfinished defence and thought to answer the arguments by silencing the speaker, that the writer "to the Hebrews" accomplished. He presents with a dignity of style worthy of the grandeur of his subject the Christian philosophy of history. He works it out mainly in reference to the problem of true worship; his theme is that in God's revelation through the Son the reality of priesthood and sacrifice has been manifested. But obviously there can be no restriction

of his thought to this sphere. Manifold as must be the extensions of his thought, the thought itself is simple and unmistakable: God has spoken once again and finally. I doubt if the writer would have been content with the well-intentioned but not very profound piety of the couplet which tells us how for other worlds God may have other words—

> But for this world the word of God is Christ.

His philosophy of history is, after all, not simply a philosophy of this world's history and of this world's religion. Not less than St. Paul does he conceive of Christ's Lordship in the Universe both before the Incarnation and after the Ascension.

Now, if Christianity is the absolute religion it must be so in virtue of its central and vitalizing principle. There must be the closest interaction between the finality of a religion, by which phrase we imply a comparison between its claims and the claims made by or on behalf of other systems in the same religious field, and its meaning. When we are busy with the meaning of a religion we are busy with its inmost core, with the centre which explains both its own growth as an organism and the outward extension of its power. Very illuminating in connection with two of the great historic religions is the position at this point. At the heart of primitive Buddhism lay the message of freedom from all desire, and the attainment of that silence of Nirvana, where peace could at last be attained through the death of desire, of consciousness, and of personality. And though that early Buddhism has sustained profound changes in the course of its historical development in the East, the ideal of Nirvana—that is, of the extinction of consciousness—has still remained as the highest ideal attainable, though only a few can hope to attain to it. In other words, the highest form of the Buddhist doctrine of salvation is a salvation dominated by the principle of negation and elimination. And when one is in touch with a religious doctrine of salvation, one is in touch with its final promises and hopes; and then one is right at its centre. And the last note in this Buddhist doctrine is not of the transcendence of the limitations of humanity, but of the passing away of humanity.

Primitive Buddhism has everything to say about man, and, in effect, nothing about God. For the Buddha himself the relationship between God and man was not a problem which troubled him at all, and if his system is regarded as atheistic that is because whatever he thought about the existence of gods he did not think that they were of any importance to man, or had anything to do with man's salvation. For Islam, on the other hand, the centre of religion resides in the sovereignty

of Allah. It is a doctrine of sheer religious transcendence. But because of the rigorous and one-sided way in which this conviction dominates the whole Mohammedan creed a vital relationship between God and man becomes impossible, except in so far as, in the case of the Sufis, there has been a reaction in the direction of a mystical pantheism. Neither in the creed of Buddha nor in the creed of Mohammed, whether in the original form or in the religious development characteristic of them, can we recognize the presence of a vitalizing principle out of which could grow a religion beyond which it would not be necessary to look, a religion capable of answering to every call which might be made upon it, and possessed of a creative power grander and more mysterious than any life-force which a Bergson or a Bernard Shaw sees at work in the processes of natural evolution.

Now, if we turn to Christianity and ask what is its very core, what is that primal fact without which the religion loses both its meaning and its power, there can be no shadow of doubt as to the answer. It is given in a verse of the last chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, a verse which seems to stand almost curiously alone, but whose inclusion serves as some brilliant illumination, which lights up in a moment the whole of its environment and discloses the features of the country in so unmistakable a manner that the traveller treads with the certainty of knowledge, and has no longer to grope for a footing here or there, to try, and to turn back from, this or that alternative. "Jesus Christ," says the writer, "is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and forever." If we could but unconventionalize our understanding of the New Testament, we should see in a moment, with the eyes of our mind truly enlightened, that into these tremendous words is packed the absoluteness of the only religion of which an absolute and final character can be asserted with any hope of a verification through experience. Let me put it like this: Jesus Christ came full of grace and truth, and that grace and truth were, and for ever are, final. He did not come from a dark background which holds in reserve further manifestations destined to overshadow even Him. If that were the case, it would be no more than a rhetorical turn, and illegitimate at that, to make His Person co-extensive with the whole past and the whole future. His arm would be shortened and He could not save—not everything and to the end. The ages to come would not be His; He might have an interest in them, but only by so preparing for them that their crowns of glory might adorn the head of another, greater than Himself. He might be the Baptist's Christ and even ours, but not the King of the Ages, the Alpha and

Omega, the unending Amen in Whom the music of all history and all life could reach its final and triumphant climax. And if anyone says that to leave the future open for some further manifestation, for what is called, though most inexactly, a further incarnation, need not affect the attitude of piety towards Jesus Christ to-day, I can but express my entire conviction that in such a case piety would find the very nerve of its devotion cut through, and would no longer be able to take upon its lips either those words of Charles Wesley than which none in any native English hymn go deeper—

> Thou, O Christ, art all I want,
> More than all in Thee I find—

or those still profounder lines (if that is possible) of the *Dies Iræ*—lines in which St. Paul and St. Augustine would have beheld the reflection of the redemption-light that burned within their souls:

> Rex tremendæ maiestatis,
> Qui salvandos salvas gratis,
> Salva me, fons pietatis.

There are three conceptions to which adequate justice must be done in any religion which professes to be, or for which the claim is made that it is, the absolute religion: the conceptions of God, of man, and of the relationship between God and man. And of these three, the most difficult and critical is the conception of the relationship; for how to bring God and man together in such a way that neither is God lost in man, nor is man a mere instrument or, at best, slave in the presence of God—that is no easy problem to solve. But in primitive Christianity it was solved, we may say right away, in Jesus Christ. There was the new relationship, and the perfect one, in Him. Take some of the great problems which confront the worker in the fields of the philosophy of religion, problems of immanence and transcendence, of the Divine omnipotence, of the suffering of God. We are not nearly finished with the theory of these things yet, and the Church of New Testament times had not begun to concern itself with their theory. But that Church was certain that it possessed in Christ a full revelation, which provided the lines along which it would have asserted that these and similar problems, had they been debated at the time, found their solution. And the Christian contention was and is that it is the religion of true personal relationship between God and man, established and continuing through One in Whom the perfection of relationship between those two terms—"God," "man"—exists, because He is the perfection of both terms: He is perfect God and perfect man.

Here we are right at the centre of Christianity. The full

content of that centre is indeed not yet apparent in what has so far been said. For the full content means the Person of Christ in all the greatness and mystery and glory of His experiences. Do let us remember that Christianity has nothing whatever to say about conceivable and formal relationships between God and man apart from Christ. The Church preaches Christ, and a philosophy only in dependence upon Him. It preaches One whose Person is not an illustration of truths which exist independently of Him, but is creative of truth. That God and man are of one substance; that God is engaged in reconciling man to Himself; that the path of man on the road to consciously realized unity with God lies through the valley of the shadow of suffering and death, and climbs to the heights of victory, and vanishes at last into the heavens above, and conducts to a seat of honour in the heavenly places—all these may be propositions philosophically arguable and mystically appropriated, but they are not distinctively Christian, they do not reveal the Christian method, they do not explain and interpret the Gospel. In all the unceasing discussions about Christian origins, in all the attempted, and often valuable, separation of different strands in our primitive documents with a view to the elucidation of what lies behind them, there is at times a danger lest the unity of the New Testament as the reverberation in writing of a preached Gospel of salvation should weigh too lightly on our minds. People sometimes talk as though the issue concerning the Person of Christ were merely a problem of formal dogmatics in a particular sphere. No greater mistake could be made. The issue is dogmatically important, but religiously it is vital. No other foundation can any man lay save that which is laid—Jesus Christ. And the whole inner growth and development, and external extension, of Christianity as the religion which claims for itself finality is explicable, and of abiding absolute value, only because of that foundation. Take two indispensable activities of the Christian Church, its worship and its evangelizing or missionary zeal. They mean Christ, they proclaim Christ, they give Christ, Christ in the fullness of His Divine Sonship, in that fullness which includes all the humiliation of His bitter Passion, all the travail of His Cross, all the triumph of His Resurrection, all the royalty of His present reign. I come by accident upon a page in a book which I have just taken up, Dr. Forsyth's *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, and this is what I find written in his criticism of the view that all religion is evolution and no religion is final: "And so, with the end of any absolute or final religion, there is an end of much that troubles the world, for instance, of Missions at least. For Christian Missions cannot live upon

improving the heathen, but only on passing them from death to life." And what is true here is true also of worship, and especially of the Eucharist. The potency of the Eucharist is not to be found in the fact that it is a banquet of religious fellowship, a pious commemoration, or even a mystical drama. It may be one or all of these, but that is not what matters. We could obtain all the benefits of such aspects of it in other ways—and many do. What matters in the Eucharist is the reality of the divine gifts—in other words, of the Gospel made available for men in a unique manner, so that Christ in the continual potency of His life, laid down in sacrificial death and taken again, becomes their Food. The mystery of the Eucharist is not, primarily, a mystery of dialectics and logic, but of life, of life imparted and life received, of spiritual realities spiritually discerned.

What I have been saying amounts to this, that the question of dogma with regard to our Lord's Person cannot be separated from, and is indeed a derivative from, that centrality of His Person in the Christian religion which constitutes the Christian Gospel and is the foundation of the claim made for that religion that it is the absolute religion. Dogma is to this extent secondary. But to say that is by no means to say that the dogmatic issue is of comparatively slight importance. On the contrary, it is closely linked up with the religious. The religious issue affects directly worship and work; the dogmatic affects them through the reaction upon them of thought. You cannot split man up into departments; you cannot revive at this point the old psychology of human nature as constituted in so many faculties; you cannot disconnect the intelligence from the emotions and the will. The impossibility, in its reference to the Person of Christ, has been put quite simply and, I would maintain, quite incontrovertibly, by an eminent Scottish theologian, Dr. H. R. Mackintosh: "One who is simply human to the mind cannot remain adorable to the conscience and the heart." The Christian response to Christ, the response of the individual believer and of the Church, is congruous with the Nicene Creed. The two fit one another. And that fitness emerges all along the line, not artificially, but by way of natural correspondence, in historic Christianity. It is an intellectual correspondence, and not simply an æsthetic one. The pre-existent Christ, the Christ born of a Virgin, the Christ of the unparalleled teaching and of the mighty works, the Christ Who made the Cross an altar, Who first hallowed the grave, and then left it empty, is the Christ Who explains Christianity. It is that Christ Who is the creative and redeeming Christ in the Church's life and discipleship.

I am not saying that those who do not share, at least in its fullness, the mind of the Church as to the Lord's Person, have made no contribution towards the living apprehension of Him. There are scholars who would fall within this class from whose work much is to be learned, not only because they are scholars, but because of what they know of the grace and truth which have been manifested and are alive in Christ. But always one must remember that we are concerned with an issue which goes far beyond the fields of scholarship or of personal piety. It is an issue which must work itself out in consequences far-reaching and subtle for the future both of the Church and of the world. And the relationship of Christ to the Church and to the world can never be determined as though He were the greatest and most splendid and holiest of private persons, without a fundamental change in the Gospel.

But it is sometimes said or implied that there is no cause at the present time for any special anxiety, that to make the past more intelligible to the present through restatement or a fresh setting is not to abandon the past, and that the Nicene Creed is one thing and any particular interpretation of it another, and that (to take up one contention which has been made and defended) to believe in the Deity of our Lord and that He is the second Person in the Holy Trinity does not necessarily imply that His existence from all eternity as the Divine Word or Son was an existence carrying with it a consciousness distinct from the consciousness of God the Father. In fact, it has been quite clearly and strongly maintained that if, when we think of God, we think of more than one centre of consciousness, we do, however unintentionally, give up the belief in the unity of God. I do not propose on this occasion to enter on the technicalities, theological and philosophical, of the subject. I would not deny that those who affirm the truths of the Incarnation and of the Deity of our Lord, while they reject the idea of the pre-existence of the Son of God as a distinct personality, do so with the conviction that they are doing justice to those great words and to the historic Christian Gospel. Nor is the warning against believing in more than one God to be disregarded. But I find it impossible to doubt that the effect to-day of a doctrine of Christ's Person which abandoned the conception of distinct personal pre-existence, and sought, apart from that conception, to explain the incarnation of the Divine Word or Son in Jesus, would be, both in the case of members of the Church who made no profession of exact theological knowledge and interest, and in the case of those who could be described as theologians or theological students, most seriously prejudicial to the faith that our Lord is perfect

God as well as perfect man. For that faith, and the formulas of the Church, both of Nicæa and of Chalcedon, mean that our Lord was God and became man. This is the meaning of the historic Catholic Christology, as Dr. Headlam has emphasized in some pages of great importance written five years ago. And he is interested in pointing out that the Catholic Christology, even when expounded technically and in detail, represents the constant belief of the ordinary religious man, who "believes simply that God came down upon earth and lived as man; that He was really God and really man." Now I do not believe that the type of Modernist Christology which I have had in mind expresses the meaning either of the historic faith or of the ordinary religious Christian man or woman to-day. Nor do I believe that it has the essential quality of staying-power, any more than the attempt which was once made to say that Christ had the value of God, and to leave the matter there. But the matter would not be left there. People will insist on going on to ask, "When you say that Christ has the value of God, do you mean that He really is God?" And if the implicit meaning, the logic of the position, has all the time been that Christ is not God, that implicit meaning will some day become explicit and undeniable. After all, there is a limit to the possible explanations of such words as "Incarnation" and "Deity," and our present troubles and difficulties are not concerned simply with different explanations of the same agreed beliefs. It is easy to look at the matter in that way, but it is not the true way. We are concerned with the beliefs themselves, whether they are believed and not merely how they are understood. And it is not an unreal danger that the words may be retained, while the faith which they are intended to conserve is strained out of them. It is a danger which is likely to beset to an increasing degree a Protestantism which does not feel at home with the Nicene Creed and sits loose to the sacramental system.

There is a word which expresses the positive objective side of Christianity, that side on which Christianity appears as the Gospel of Salvation, more adequately than any other. It is the word "Grace," a word with deep roots in the Bible and a long history in Christian thought, a word susceptible of misuse and of unintelligent use, but a great word, a word of achievement and a word of promise. When it is truly used it lifts Christianity clean off the level of philosophical speculation and of natural religion, and Christianity is manifested as revelation from God and redemption by God. For Grace is the love of God in active exercise on behalf of sinful men. You lose the width of the scope of Grace and the profundity of its penetration unless you bring in that adjective "sinful." The

Gospel is a Gospel for a perishing world and for men who have no true life except they have the true God. For the river of life proceeds from out of the throne of God, and as it flows it heals and blesses, and there is no wilderness so desolate and dreary which may not be changed by its waters into a garden of the Lord. So is Christ, our Lord, in the world and with men. So He works through the Church, which is His body. And the Church, in loyalty to that precious blood of His Cross whereby He purchased her for ever, the Church which has no standing, no rights, no powers save those which are all of His Grace, knows Who He is and answers, "My Lord and My God."

J. K. Mozley.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

It would, I suppose, be conceded by nearly all thoughtful people that at the present time the greatest need of the world is that there should be an effective international society with ideal aims functioning everywhere. It has become most painfully obvious that the uncontrolled desire for personal ends has brought misery and not happiness to civilized society. Almost equally obvious is it that when men have limited the sphere of their mental and practical activities to their own class, their own group, their own nation, those activities, in the long-run, have been fatal to the peace and prosperity of the world. The Great War—and the so-called Peace—have demonstrated this to a certainty. The blind and the deaf may not, as yet, see and hear, but the eyes of the wilfully blind are everywhere being opened by facts, and even the ears of the stupidly deaf are at last becoming unstopped. The world needs, as it never needed before, an authoritative voice which will make men listen to and heed the words, "Sirs, ye are brethren, why do ye wrong one to another?"

Now, from the beginning of the Christian era, it has been the belief of the overwhelming majority of the followers of Christ that an "international Society with ideal aims" was, as a matter of fact, founded by Jesus Christ the Son of God, and that this Society has been known through the centuries as the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. Unhappily it has not been fully "effective," unhappily it does not "function everywhere"; but, in common with Christians from the beginning, we hold that it exists, that its life is from God and cannot be destroyed, and that its ultimate effectiveness and universality depend on how far men and women "of good-

will" are prepared, by lives of sacrifice, to co-operate with the Divine purpose for the regeneration of mankind.

I gather that one of the objects of this Congress is to press on the attention of the people the importance of a true and spiritual view of what the Church is, and I do not, therefore, apologize for making use of some recently quoted words of Archbishop Temple preached at the consecration of Truro Cathedral:

"Throughout the teaching of the Apostles we see that it is the Church that comes first, and the members of it afterwards. Men were not brought to Christ and then determined that they would live in a community. Men were not brought to Christ to believe in Him and His Cross, and to recognize the duty of worshipping the Heavenly Father in His Name, and then decided that it would be a great help to their religion that they should join one another in that worship, and should be united in the bonds of fellowship for that purpose. In the New Testament, on the contrary, the kingdom of heaven is already in existence, and men are invited into it. The Church takes its origin not in the will of man but in the will of the Lord Jesus Christ. He sent forth His Apostles, the Apostles received their commission from Him. . . . They came first, and the members came afterwards. . . . Everywhere men are called in; they do not come in and make the Church by coming. They are called in to that which already exists; they are recognized as members when they are within; but their membership depends on their admission, and not upon their constituting themselves into a body in the sight of the Lord."

Now, there are a great many people who, while willing to allow that these words may be true, and even interesting in a theoretical way, are inclined to think that, practically, and for the purposes of Church life, all this does not very much matter. They say, in effect, "The Church of England is good enough for me. My loyalty and devotion are given to the Church of my country, which is the only religious society I am familiar with and which represents all that is best and most refined in English life." Some time ago the Church of England was even described as a "self-going concern." In a sense this is, of course, true. In the deepest sense it is both false and pernicious. Christianity is in its very essence universal, the revelation of the All-Father's Love in the One Christ through the One Spirit in the One Body. I will put what I want to express in words of the lately issued Lambeth Report on Christian Unity:

(1) "The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God."

(2) "The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit."

(3) "As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church."

(9) "The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church."

Now I wonder what answer would be given by a hundred Anglicans (taken at random) to the question, "Why do I belong to the Church of England?" The answers would, I fear, be various and perhaps startling. There is only one right answer: "I belong to the Church of England because Jesus Christ founded One Catholic Church, and the Church of England is a true and fully organized part of that One Church." As the Lambeth Report says, "It is the local representative of the One Church." There should be no conflict of thought between our belief in the English Church and our belief in the Catholic Church, as there should be no opposition between our care for the interests of all nations and our care for the interests of our own nation. For there is no *necessary* antithesis between Nationalism and Internationalism.

> "God gave all men all earth to love,
> But since our hearts are small,
> Ordained for each one spot should prove
> Beloved over all."
>
> RUDYARD KIPLING.

Some words of Dr. Glover in *The Pilgrim* may well be taken to heart by people who shrink from getting outside narrow boundaries in religion:

"Can a man be called educated who has never intelligently got outside the insular and contemporary? Can he be called a man at all? It is not so that men are made. . . . Is it possible that we Anglo-Saxons, who are not usually considered by impartial observers to have all the gifts and graces of the Greek (to say nothing of the Italian and some other races not ungifted), that we, of all people, can be sufficient to ourselves?"

Now this does not in the least imply that we should think little of, or depreciate in words, our own part of the Church. It is time to say boldly that good Anglicans should be good Catholics, *and* that good Catholics should be good Anglicans. It is mean and foolish to harp perpetually on the shortcomings of the English Church. We know what these shortcomings are well enough. But we also know that the *Ecclesia Anglicana* has been led and guided through the most extraordinary experiences for some great and special purpose in the Providence of God. We know that, however imperfectly, here is a Church which gives us the fullness of Catholic teaching, and the possibilities of full Catholic life, devotional and practical. Herein is the Apostolic Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Here are the Catholic Creeds and the Catholic Sacraments.

Here is Penance. Here is the Mass. Here is a splendid and unequalled Version of the Holy Scriptures. Here is a Liturgy, scarred indeed with the marks of half-forgotten controversies, but expressing in the most noble language all that is essential to Catholic Worship. And, above all, here is Liberty. Too much, perhaps, but far, far better than too little.

"The Church is," as Newman said, "the concrete representation of things invisible." It is the Divine Society founded by Jesus Christ to carry on His work on earth. And we believe that for us, here and now, the Church of England is the local representative of the Church Catholic. The Church is the Body of Christ. It is the embodiment of Christ's Ideals, the Teacher of His Faith, the storehouse of His Grace. What we believe is what the whole Church has believed: "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*"

Out of the Church's treasures are brought things new and old, but not new things which contradict old things, nor things old in exactly the old form. And when people ask us—"Is this view of authority in belief quite clear? Quite satisfactory? Perfectly easy for anyone to understand?" we readily answer, "No! it is not at all satisfactory—to the thoughtless, the superficial, the half-in-earnest." But it is increasingly satisfactory to the rapidly advancing number of men and women who are willing to accept the principle of authority in religion when that authority is neither crudely stated nor coercively exercised; and it is increasingly satisfactory to the multitude of the believers in Christ who are honestly convinced that there is for them a genuine value in the words, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty."

What we need is, not a mere acceptance of the fact of the Pentecostal outpouring having once happened, but a passionate belief in the present outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Church, and on each individual believer. The obstacles to unity, for instance, are mountainous. But what are these obstacles compared to the obstacles in front of the Apostolic band after the day of fire from on high? The religious prejudice of Judaism, firm and constant, the compact and world-wide might of Imperial Rome, the intellectual supremacy of Greece, these were the tremendous rocks in front. We know what happened:

> "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in His Presence" (1 Cor. i. 27-29).

It is because "we believe in the Holy Ghost" that we hold there is a real reason why this Congress should be held, for its

> "purpose and aim . . . is to extend the knowledge of Catholic Faith and Practice at home and abroad, and, by this means, to bring men and women to a true realization of our Lord Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour and King."

The Church Catholic is the Divine instrument for carrying out the Divine Will. But that the Divine Will is hindered and thwarted on all sides is, alas, only too evident. The lapsing into practical heathenism as regards faith and morals of large masses of people whose forbears were Christian is, as we know, one of the most terrible signs of decadence at the present day. Why is it? Everywhere Christians are appalled by what is going on, and everywhere they ask themselves this question.

Well! Supposing we really believe what we repeat at least on every Sunday, and supposing it is true that the Church cannot be effective and function everywhere unless it is what God the Holy Ghost intends it to be—One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic—what is our plain, our manifest duty? This, most assuredly: To do what we can, in our own Communion first, and in our own day—to think, to pray, and to work, so that the Church's unity may no longer be a mere phrase, the Church's holiness no longer an uncared-for ideal, the Church's Catholicity no longer an impossible dream, the Church's Apostolicity no longer a mere formal principle.

Let us link our poor thoughts to the Eternal Purposes, and our frail wills to the All-Powerful Will of God. He wills that the human race, and each individual member of it, should be completely saved, here and hereafter, through Jesus Christ. He wills that Christ's Body, His Church, should literally be the "international Society with ideal aims functioning everywhere." But that the Divine Purposes may be accomplished the co-operation of our wills is necessary. He has chosen us in very deed to be "fellow-workers" in this supreme enterprise.

1. First of all, then, God intends the Church to be *One*. One in Faith and purpose, a Divine Human Society, a Fellowship in Faith and in Good Works, a Home of Divine Love. This is the ideal, this is the pattern! But what is the reality? Christendom divided and rent asunder: the spirit of injustice in criticism, and littleness in controversy, only too manifest. Christians unable to share together the deepest and highest spiritual expressions; unable to work together without jealousy; unable to worship together without constraint and unreality, unable to witness together for the Kingship of Christ over a world which has disowned Him.

We Catholics ought to have the warmest sympathy for all who are striving for unity among Christians. We may not, indeed, agree with schemes and proposals put forth by the authorities from time to time. We may deprecate hasty and ill-considered action in such matters, for instance, as interchange of pulpits, but if we have listened to Christ's words "that they all may be one," we are, it seems to me, bound to be constructive and not merely critical in this matter. It is so fatally easy to criticize, and do nothing; but it is surely true that before we can contemplate as a practical possibility corporate reunion, on any terms, with the Historical Church of West and East, and before we can hope for what is called home reunion with the Nonconformist bodies, we must ourselves possess and manifest much more internal unity within the Church of England than we now have.

"Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself" (Ps. cxxii. 3).

Is it not, I venture to ask, possible for the Anglo-Catholic Congresses to make for peace *within* the borders of our own Communion by presenting the Catholic religion in such a form as to be inclusive of all that is best in the affirmations of the three schools of thought which, in the main, make up—and, unhappily, sometimes divide—the Church of England?

Baron Von Hügel says that true religion must be (1) Institutional, (2) Mystical, (3) Theological. Superficially, these three characteristics represent respectively the Catholic, Evangelical, and Liberal parties in the Church of England. And must we go on using the word "parties" at all? Cannot the division cease, and the schools of thought having forgot their negations bring their true and *positive* spiritual possessions into the storehouse of the riches of the House of God?

Catholics should be whole-heartedly Evangelistic, and recognize that the Church itself is only a means to the great end of the conquest of the world for Christ. And they must cease to be merely traditionalists, and welcome what the Holy Ghost in these latter days has taught and does teach through the discoveries of science and through the reverent speculations of enlightened human intelligence.

Cannot our Evangelical friends give up suspecting us of designs to enslave men and women to puerile superstitions by means of a stupid sort of secret priestcraft? We recognize increasingly how important their witness is to the reality of spiritual experiences, and we whole-heartedly admire their splendid missionary record. Of course we allow—who can help allowing it?—that in the heat of the conflicts of the past eighty years many unwise and hurtful things have been said

and done on all sides, and many rash and sectional adventures have been entered on without due thought for the true interests of the whole Body of Christ. But can we never forgive and forget? Are we always to fight and devour one another? Cannot we at last understand that the only victory worth having is a victory for the Rule of Jesus Christ in His Church and that the fruits of this victory would be reconciliation, peace, and life within the Body and a mighty forward movement to convert the world to the Master it has forgotten?

Personally I believe that the signs of such a reconciliation are everywhere manifest. Let us thank God for it.

"Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?" (Cant. vi. 10).

I do not intend to speak of plans for unity beyond the borders of our own Communion. If we set our own house in order, and if we cultivate the temper of understanding and fellowship, unity will come in God's own way and in His time.

2. We can find the second great cause of the Church's ineffectiveness in the unsatisfactory witness it bears to the character of Jesus Christ. The Church is intended to be Holy, like Christ, the Head of the Church. We often explain Holy Church to mean that the Church is dwelt in by the Holy Spirit, possesses the Holy Scriptures, and dispenses the Holy Sacraments. And ideally this is, of course, an adequate explanation; Holy Church, does, potentially, mean something like this. But when we think of the Church's witness, the Church's mission to the world, we know that the life of the Church must be Holy, and that the lives of the Church's members, priests and people alike, must be holy if the Church is to impress and convert the world. No established status, no perfection of organization, no intellectual eminence, no philanthropic activities will be of avail if "the one thing needful" is left out or even slighted and ignored. Side by side with these Anglo-Catholic Congresses there is going on in England a movement for the spiritual training of Priests for the urgently required work of learning how to become worthier witnesses and messengers for Christ. Conferences, gatherings for study and prayer, above all Retreats, are being held. It is a good sign, a great augury for the future of the Church. But would to God all this were on a much larger scale. History teaches us plainly that disasters come to the fabric of religion when men are willing to keep the outward form and have forgotten the inner spirit of what religion is.* Judgment must begin with the House of God, and if we Priests

* "When the devil captures an organization for his purposes, he never changes the name."—Dean Inge.

re-learn our religion to some purpose, it will most assuredly be possible to "launch out into the deep," *in obedience to the Master's command and with the certainty of ultimate success.*

Father Rickaby, S.J., was not very far wrong when he wrote the words, "If there had been Retreats for Clergy before the sixteenth century, the world would have seen no other Blessed Reformation."

If the Church, then, is to win the people, the people must see Christ in and through the Church. We must become a Church that cares for all the interests of the people in the temper of Christ and not according to the traditional policy of the establishment. A Church that ceaselessly encourages and cultivates, by old and new methods, the inner and spiritual life of children as well as that of men and women; a Church with a *heart*, fearing above all to criticize or check ardent devotion, even though the devotion may sometimes break through the sacred barriers of an Act of Uniformity. Zeal, with knowledge and discretion. Yes. But we have had such a surfeit of discretion and caution—without zeal—that our very life has been frozen hard. Unity, holiness. But above all, holiness; the Christ spirit, the Christ temper, the Christ life. Divinely the Church *is* Holy; humanly, with Divine help, let us make the Church holy.

How profoundly true are these words of the great Bishop Creighton:

> "Religion is always decaying in the hands of the multitude; it has to be revived by individuals; and we who are engaged in teaching Christianity as a religion, as a means of establishing a relation between the soul and God, must never allow it to fall into the sphere of the world's activities."

3. Thirdly, we need to recover more completely the Apostolic ideal of the ministry. And towards attaining this I cannot help feeling that notable progress has been made ever since the Evangelical and Catholic revivals. With the greatest respect and reverence for the present occupants of the English Sees, and allowing that Divine Providence has wonderfully overruled our most imperfect arrangements, it is nevertheless hard to believe the Church's witness can be considered religious or that the world can be much impressed by our unworldliness as long as we tolerate our Bishops—the successors of the Apostles—being nominated by a purely secular official of the State, however eminent, wise, and unprejudiced. (And as for the ecclesiastical check of the *congé d'élire* in the ancient Dioceses, the less we try to explain this ecclesiastical camouflage to the outside world, so much the better.)

But notwithstanding the State appointment of our chief Pastors, notwithstanding the very regrettable want of Diocesan Synods in many Dioceses, notwithstanding our chaotic system of patronage and the absurdities of freehold benefices—who can doubt that on the whole the Apostolic ministry of the Church of England represents a noble ideal of Service for God and His people. It no longer stands for mere power or privilege. Our Bishops have faithfully and nobly led the way in the recovery of the true ideal.

If our local Church is indeed to represent and mediate all that is permanent—and "of Christ"—in the ideal Catholic Church, it remains for us all, clergy and laity, to care about the spirit as well as the form of the Apostolic Succession, and, by prayer and sacrifice, to gain for the Church an Apostolic ministry worthily representing "the chosen generation, the royal priesthood, the peculiar people" whose vocation from the Master is to be "the salt of the earth and the light of the world."

4. And lastly, holding as we do, that, in the words of a great theologian (Sohm), "Catholicism is as old as the Church itself; there is no rival form. It was from the first in possession"—and glorying in the name Catholic because we hold it is Christianity complete, we desire to affirm again that the Church cannot be effective unless the word "Catholic" expresses the universality of Christ's reign over all human interests and over human lives in all nations.

It may or may not be good advice to tell people "to think imperially." It is assuredly good advice to tell people to think universally—*i.e.*, as Catholics.

I have tried to make it clear that this does not mean slighting our own Communion. What it does mean is that we are to think of human life as fundamentally One. It means the Unity of God and the Trinity of Eternal Love. It means New Testament Christianity, historical Christianity, the Christianity of the future. It means the acknowledgment of the universal Saviour, the acceptance of the universal Creeds, the study of the universal Word, the practice of the universal Worship, the use of the universal Sacraments.

All universal according to God's Will. None universal, unless and until we obey the supreme command of the universal King of kings and Lord of lords:

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20).

J. J. G. Stockley.

THE HEARING OF CONFESSIONS*

I.

In a letter dated 1844 John Keble writes: "We go on working in the dark, and in the dark it will be, until the rule of systematic confession is received in our Church. . . . We are in our parishes like people whose lantern has blown out, and who are feeling their way, and continually stepping in puddles and splotches of mud, which they think are dry stones."†

God has indeed wonderfully blessed the cause of Catholic truth in this land, since John Keble wrote those words nearly eighty years ago; and the fact that we are to consider this subject to-day is evidence to that effect.

I understand, then, my subject to be strictly what its title declares; considerations on the method by which a priest should exercise his office in the administration of the Sacrament of Penance; in what manner, and on what principles, he should order himself in the receiving of Confessions. I am therefore not attempting to deal with the preliminary question of how best to help our people to seek the benefit of Absolution. That is a very important subject. There can be little doubt that many communicants are in grave need of Confession, while many others have given up Communion because they have fallen into grievous sin and feel themselves unfit to approach the Altar. We clergy are sometimes to blame. We have not given plain intelligible teaching, whether by the sick-bed or in instruction for Confirmation, or from the pulpit. We have believed ourselves to be doing so; but we have wrapped up our teaching in such vague and general language that it has made little or no impression on our hearers.

(1) Let me speak, for a moment, of some of the conditions that go to make a good Confessor; remembering that, of course, a great deal can only come as the result of experience.

First, then, the Confessor must be a spiritually-minded man. He will be endeavouring himself to lead a regulated, disciplined life. This is necessary, partly because without it he will lack the spiritual judgment and power that are the fruit of an earnest religious life; and also because his own efforts, failures and victories, will give him the knowledge and insight to help another on the same road. He will, of course, be in the habit of making his own Confession. It is obviously repugnant to a sincere and humble man to minister to others a Sacrament which he does not use himself. Many of us will recall how that feeling influenced Dr. Pusey to prepare for his first Confession to Mr. Keble; or how Mr. Butler, in his early days at Wantage, was led to do the same. I hope, too, that all of us are familiar with the touching piece of autobiography which Father Congreve gives us in the "Address in Preparation for a General Communion," given at the Church of Cowley St. John. Above all, the Confessor will be seeking to make his own the Mind of Christ; in particular, he must be learning that zeal for souls which has the wisdom and the

* This and the following paper were read to a Conference of Clergy only.

† Coleridge's *Memoir of J. Keble*, p. 300.

courage to combine true and loving severity with the tenderest sympathy and patience. And he will, I suppose, find the chief means of acquiring this in his frequent and devout Communions, and in diligent meditation on the Holy Scriptures—and especially on the Gospels—that he may steep himself more and more in the spirit of his Master.

Besides these qualifications, he must possess some technical knowledge of his craft. Many of us, I suppose, have to admit that we find ourselves but amateurs in this most serious and responsible work. There may have been improvement in recent years; but I think that when I was at a Theological College I received no kind of systematic instruction in this matter. I cannot help thinking that more serious provision should be made, both by the staffs of our Theological Colleges and through the Bishops' examining Chaplains, to secure that a man who offers himself for the priesthood should have received adequate training for this important part of his work. It should include the study of at least the elements of moral theology, and of casuistry, with some acquaintance with ascetic theology.

But I have in mind more practical details as well: though I almost hesitate to take your time over such elementary points. Let me refer to them quite summarily. In every Church where Confessions are heard, public notice to that effect should be given, on the Church boards, and in the Parish Magazine, naming the days and hours when the Clergy may regularly be found in Church for that purpose. Confessions should be heard in the open Church. The custom, which sometimes obtains, of hearing them in the Vestry, the Mission House, or the Parsonage, is surely undesirable, and tends to encourage the notion that Confession is an unusual and secretive affair, which must be transacted in the privacy of some remote place. No doubt there are circumstances which may make such privacy necessary: a very small Church, when a congregation is present; a penitent afflicted with deafness, or some other infirmity, which requires the raising of the voice, and so on. But it is well to emphasize the fact that Penance is a Sacrament, natural and normal, like any of the other Sacraments. The hearing of Confessions in the open Church is instructive to the people; is salutary to the penitent; and is a safeguard to the priest. Whether a "Confessional Box" is used, or merely a slight screen, or only a kneeling desk beside a chair, is of comparative unimportance; though, in the latter case, the priest should be careful to avoid an attitude that may seem to suggest an intimate personal conversation between the penitent and himself. The priest will, of course, sit throughout. He will not stand to give either the Absolution or the Blessing; nor will he raise his hand, much less place it on the head of the penitent. These points are more than trifles: a principle is involved. Nothing should be done by the Confessor which could convey to a spectator whether Absolution has been given or withheld. In the same way, the words of the penitent and the priest should be inaudible to anyone but themselves. It may be added that no rules can provide for emergencies. A sudden demand to hear a Confession—*e.g.*, in visiting a sick case—may make it impossible to use a surplice and stole.

(2) In every Sacrament the work of the priest is to bring the soul into vital contact and correspondence with God in Christ. Emphatically is this so in the Sacrament of Penance; and personality, both of Confessor and penitent, cannot but enter as a condition into the exercise and spiritual value of this ministry.

There are differences in the conditions of penitents, and therefore in the kinds of Confessions, and in the methods of dealing with them. There are the differences between men and women, old and young, children and adults, priests and laity, religious and secular. These are natural and necessary distinctions; and a spiritual judgment is needed to enable the Confessor to deal wisely and rightly with each. There are also the distinctions between the scrupulous and the dull of conscience; between those who are making a first Confession, and those who have used the Sacrament for years. There is also an important distinction arising from the contents of the Confession. The "matter" of the Sacrament of Penance is sin committed after Baptism; which may be mortal sin or venial sin. This distinction is, of course, a Scriptural one, and of great importance. It may be difficult, or even dangerous, to attempt to define too strictly into which class any particular act of sin may fall. But the distinction is a real one. Either mortal or venial sin is sufficient matter for the Sacrament; and the priest can give Absolution if only venial sins have been confessed. The Book of Common Prayer indicates this distinction when it speaks of those whose consciences are "troubled with any weighty matter." Many penitents seek the Tribunal not because they are conscious of mortal sin, but because they desire the spiritual help which this ministry can bring to them. We have to recognize, then, the distinction between Confessions of obligation and Confessions of devotion, as they are sometimes called.

Let us consider a little more in detail how the Confessor is to deal with the penitent. It may be well to remember here that he must be prepared to give simple assistance, or instruction, at the time of Confession, if the penitent should be illiterate, or nervous, or insufficiently prepared, or seriously ignorant of the elements of the Faith.

The priest, then, is set to present Christ to the penitent in three main relationships: (1) As the Redeemer from sin; (2) as the Standard of holiness; (3) as the Source of spiritual life. And he seeks to produce in the penitent a conscious and deliberate movement, of mind and heart and will, for the deepening of the sense of sin, the enlightening of conscience, and the quickening of spiritual desire, by which he may profitably receive the benefit of Absolution. Bearing this in mind, we remember that the penitent, after making his Confession, asks for three things: Penance, Counsel, and Absolution; and we can most conveniently deal with the Confessor's duty under these heads, though we will take them in the reverse order.

(i.) Absolution.—This is the primary purpose for which the Confession is made. It is in the granting of it that there is required the exercise of judgment, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in accordance with the laws and requirements of the Church. In ordinary cases it will be given, after advice and suggestion, warning and encouragement, and the imposition of a penance, the form of Absolution being that which is contained in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. But there are cases where the decision as to the granting of Absolution presents serious difficulties. There are some Confessions, so called, which really contain no matter for Absolution. Some simple old souls, living guarded and quiet lives, will bring a rambling report of themselves, without any admission, or apparently any recognition, of sins committed. Sympathetic questioning may produce the recognition of sin. But if this fails, it would seem best to let the penitent depart with a blessing. Or the Confession may be

obviously incomplete, through want of careful preparation. In this case, it is almost always possible to help the penitent to finish his preparation there and then. But occasionally he has to be enjoined to come later, after having made a thorough self-examination. The same procedure is necessary where the penitent admits that on some previous occasion a deliberately insincere and incomplete Confession was made. This has, of course, invalidated the Absolutions received since; and a General Confession, covering the period in question, must be required. If this can be made at the time, the Confessor can deal with the penitent at once: otherwise his Absolution must be deferred till he can present a complete Confession. It should be added that when a penitent remembers in Confession a sin or sins of the past that had hitherto altogether escaped his memory, he may mention them, without the need of a General Confession of the past. The Confessor may sometimes have reason to suspect that the penitent is lacking in seriousness and contrition, is making a formal Confession. He will endeavour to stimulate sincerity and sorrow; but if he is persuaded of the unsatisfactory condition of the penitent, he may have to refuse Absolution on that ground. However, he will generally be able to decide by the penitent's willingness or otherwise to accept the requirements as to satisfaction and amendment. This not infrequently presents a situation in which Absolution must be withheld. The penitent may refuse to avoid occasions of sin, or to take some necessary step with regard to restitution, or to carry out some other plain duty. And Absolution has to be refused. However, in such a case, the penitent should be advised that he has a right to seek the ministration of another priest if he desires to do so.

I do not attempt to consider the question of reserved cases, because in the present discipline of the Church of England the Bishops unfortunately do not exercise their authority in this matter. But there are occasions when the Confessor may feel himself obliged, from the difficulty of the case presented to him, to advise the penitent to make his Confession to some more experienced priest: or he may ask his permission to submit the case—without, of course, disclosing the penitent's identity—to some theologian.

(ii.) Counsel.—The purpose of the advice given in the Confessional is to illuminate and stimulate the conscience of the penitent. In the case of some who make frequent confessions of devotion, little if any advice will be needed. In all cases the counsel should be, if possible, brief and to the point. We should avoid general discursive considerations on the spiritual life, or even an attempt to deal with every item of the Confession. We should rather touch on the more serious faults, indicating the principle that lies at the root of them, with such advice as seems useful.

It will almost always be well to assume that the dispositions of a penitent are good, unless we have reason to doubt it. Therefore we shall incline to sympathy and gentleness, rather than to severity and rebuke. It may be well to mention here that we shall find ourselves constantly required to emphasize the distinction between temptation and sin—*e.g.*, that the assault of evil imaginations is not in itself sinful, so long as these have been neither invited, welcomed, nor deliberately indulged. Also that to forgive an injury is not necessarily to excuse it or condone it. Justice and reason may require that the wrong cannot be palliated or disregarded, while charity demands that no personal resentment or desire for revenge be indulged.

As to putting questions to the penitent, our rule should be to avoid them as far as possible: though there are occasions when they are inevitable. Father Belton suggests three principles for general guidance:* (*a*) That questions should be asked at the proper time; we should not, unless absolutely necessary, interrupt the penitent while making his Confession; (*b*) they should be asked with discrimination; we must not bother the penitent with unnecessary and irrelevant questions; (*c*) they should be prudent and cautious; we must be careful that, by our questioning, we do not suggest sin, or arouse curiosity about it. On the other hand, as Father Bickersteth† reminds us: "The penitent who is treated in a superficial and perfunctory fashion by a timid or careless priest may rejoice at the moment that he is spared the shame of a painful disclosure, but the Absolution does not bring him solid, lasting peace, and he may learn to think very lightly of sins half-confessed and easily absolved."

Our business, however, is not to undertake the responsibility of "direction" in the sense of controlling the spiritual life of the penitent. There are those who are only too ready thus to put their souls into the keeping of another. We should not encourage this. Dr. Pusey writes: "The subject of 'direction' is entirely distinct from that of 'confession.' The office of the Confessor ends with the confession. He retains no right over the conscience. . . . Our office is not to supersede, but to develop and deepen the sense of responsibility; to teach those who look to us for guidance how to use the judgment which God has given them: to furnish them with clear principles to discern right from wrong."‡ We may remember the misery and injury endured by Mme. de Chantal for nearly three years, under the unintelligent direction of an over-zealous Confessor.

(iii.) PENANCE.—The acceptance of a penance is intended to represent the readiness of the penitent to submit to the discipline involved in the consequences of sin; while it may also serve as a protection against temptation, and a means of strengthening the will. The penance imposed should be, as far as may be, in proportion both to the gravity of the offence, and the ability and condition of the penitent. It is best in most cases that the penance should be short and simple and easily fulfilled; not of an elaborate nature, nor extended over a prolonged period. And the Confessor should state clearly whether it is to be used once, or repeated; and if so, for how long. The Confessor should, of course, be careful not to give a penance of such a kind as might betray the nature of the sin. Nor can the penitent be required, though in certain circumstances he may be advised, to incriminate himself: unless such concealment involves injury to another. In cases where restitution in necessary—*e.g.*, in the case of theft—it is almost always possible to discharge the obligation without revealing the penitent's identity.

(3) A few additional points must be briefly dealt with. It is probably unnecessary to emphasize the stringent obligation to observe the Seal of Confession, which is explicitly enjoined in the English Canons of 1603. No information received in the Confessional can be used outside it, except, it may be, to form the subject of our prayers. It resides, as it were, on a different level of our consciousness; and must be regarded as matter simply not known to us. In answering questions, in writing testimonials, and under all circumstances, we speak and act exactly as we should if such knowledge had never come to us. It is not permissible for the

* *A Manual for Confessors*, p. 69 *f.* † *The Ministry of Absolution*, p. 52
‡ Preface to Gaume, pp. clvi, clxi.

Confessor, in speaking to the penitent himself outside the Confessional, to refer to the matter of the Confession, unless express permission has been given; or to alter his attitude towards the penitent as a result of his Confession. Nor can we be too careful to avoid indirect and unintentional violation of the Seal, as by indiscreet conversation with fellow-priests with regard to the spiritual condition of those under our charge.

A penitent will sometimes, especially after a first Confession, ask advice as to frequency of Confession. It is obvious that different persons need different rules. And in any case we should bear in mind that the rule should not be so rigid as to become mechanical, but should allow for spontaneity and reality. Dr. Pusey* says: "In a matter so very tender and delicate as the relation of the soul to God, I should think that any hard, dry, technical rules would be an undue interference with God's inward leading of the soul, and that it would be far safer to leave the frequency to the soul itself."

There are some penitents who desire to make General Confessions from time to time. A General Confession is sometimes necessary; as for those who have made invalid or incomplete Confessions. It may also be useful at some solemn turning-point in life. But the desire to repeat General Confessions periodically is almost certainly to be discouraged, as tending to unhealthy introspectiveness and scrupulosity.

We may often be called upon to hear the Confessions of those who are considerably older, more experienced, intellectually superior, or spiritually more advanced, than ourselves. It is an occasion for self-humiliation, and a renewal of complete dependence upon the Holy Spirit. We associate ourselves with the cry of the Baptist: "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" It is, thank God, not seldom that the exercise of this ministry reveals to us heights of moral effort and spiritual earnestness, which act both as a reproach and an inspiration to ourselves.

Let me conclude with some solemn words of Dr. Pusey†: "Blessed as this office is, there is none so full of peril to those who are not in the full aim and desire of their hearts seeking to live to God. Sin is an awful thing to handle. To hear of it continually, and not to be defiled with nor dulled to it; to hear of the defilement of every sense, and keep watch over his own, comes not from man himself but from the continual persevering and refreshing grace of God. It is, then, a call the more to us to cleave fast to God; to be jealously watchful over ourselves, guard speech habitually, train ourselves in holy discipline; to be strict with ourselves, that we may know how to be tenderly careful of others; hate all motions of sin in ourselves, that we may teach others to hate it with a holy shrinking; love Him much Who we trust has forgiven us, that we may teach others, being much forgiven, much to love; and study deep humility and fervent prayer lest we fall into the snare of the devil. For as the reward is great, so is the peril."

G. W. Hockley.

II.

It may be said of the clergy of the Church of England, who, in the eighteenth century, were supposed to be the *stupor mundi* because of their learning, that they run serious risk now of being the *stupor mundi* because of their lack of it. I do not mean, of course, that they are illiterate.

* Preface to Gaume, p. clv.

† Sermon on "The Entire Absolution of the Penitent."

They have had, most of them, what we are pleased to call a university education, and, in their early lives at any rate, they were acquainted with Latin and Greek. It is professional learning which they lack. You go to a doctor or a solicitor for expert opinions on certain subjects. The one will competently advise you in medicine; the other in law. You feel that you can leave the care of your health or the care of your legal interests safely in their capable hands. But a vast number of the clergy are not experts in religion or in religious knowledge. A person in religious difficulties in the Church of England does not, as a matter of course, consult a priest. He hesitates to put his soul in our hands. The reason is that the priest is not regarded as an expert, and in many cases does not deserve to be so regarded. The results of this in parishes are lamentable. People go for spiritual advice to quacks or to newspapers. It is impossible, therefore, to exaggerate the importance of priests being trained to be competent Confessors. Probably there are few things which make more difference in the spiritual life of a priest, or where failure is more serious. Bad advice, or no advice when advice is needed, may be retarding the spiritual growth of many souls. Besides, it soon gets about if a man can help or not.

(1) Among the souls under our charge there will almost certainly be some who are being called to practise the art of prayer in some of its higher branches. It is, I am sure, a mistake to suppose that contemplative prayer is a form of prayer to which very few are called, and which can only be practised in the cloister. On the contrary, there are a number of people living in the world who might, to a greater or less extent, develop in this direction. This calls for wise advice from the Confessor. If a soul is kept to the practice of meditation when it ought to be advancing to some form of affective prayer, the whole of the devotional life will be made distasteful, the soul will be utterly discouraged, and will think that something is seriously wrong. The inability to meditate, which was really a sign that meditation was now to be left behind for a higher form of mental prayer, may be taken as an indication that even meditation is beyond the powers, and there may be a relapse to the practice of nothing but vocal prayer. Again, there is the practice of mortifications. Some are called to them, perhaps in an outstanding degree; but it is very easy to be deceived by self-will and pride. When he comes across a soul desirous to undertake the practice of bodily austerities, the Confessor needs to go very warily and carefully. A wrong decision may do infinite harm. We want to think out cases carefully. It might be a good exercise to take that wonderful spiritual document, the life of Father William Doyle the Jesuit, with its almost unbelievable record of inflicted severities —at one time he made himself a discipline out of the blades of safety-razors—and ask oneself what one would have advised if one was directing such a soul, with its fierce desire to make the body suffer. I believe there are still amongst us a fair number of clergy who would always discourage and disallow the practice of bodily mortifications. Yet these mortifications are supported by the whole weight of Catholic tradition, and undoubtedly many souls have been helped by them to reach a high state of sanctity. On the other hand, unwise mortifications will do enormous harm. Every now and then the Confessor comes across difficult cases where, perhaps, the whole future of a soul depends on his decision. This work of guiding advancing souls will not be attractive to all. The people God chooses are not always the people we should choose. The pious

women in a parish, for example, are often the target of the scorn and contempt of men and women of the world, and not infrequently this attitude is echoed in the conversation of the parish priest. We are a little ashamed of them. It is not perhaps difficult to understand. Their limitations of intelligence, their indifference to personal appearance, irritate and annoy. But if we feel like that towards souls who are living very near God and whose sole ambition is to please Him, it shows that our values are all wrong. A number of persons of this type, however stupid and contemptible they may be in the eyes of the world, are the glory of a parish, and the successful work that is done in it may be more the offspring of their prayers than of our abilities or of anything else. Do not let us, then, be impatient with these people. You would think, to listen to the conversation of some clergymen, that they really did not desire great piety in their flocks. It may be very good for souls to be snubbed—it trains them in humility; but it is not good for those who snub them—it hardens them in pride.

(2) In hearing the Confessions of advancing souls there is need of an accurate diagnosis. We must be able to tell at what point in the interior life the penitent stands, for on this, to a very large extent, the advice given will depend. We must have in our mind, then, a kind of map of the stages of the spiritual life. We must know the course generally taken in the development of a soul. It might be possible to make such a map, founding it on the exercise called "The Three Modes of Humility," in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola. These modes of humility are really three stages in the inner life. In the first stage the dominating thought is not to entertain the thought of transgressing any commandment, divine or human, that binds under mortal sin. In the second, a further advance is made: "Not for all creation, nor for a threat to take my life, would I seriously contemplate the commission of a venial sin." Lastly, there comes the highest stage of all when, everything being equal, the soul chooses poverty and reproaches when, without any sin, it might choose the opposite. If we are bent, however, on classifying souls—and we must to some extent do this for the sake of clearness of thought—it is perhaps best to do it under the old classification of advancing souls as being in either the purgative, the illuminative, or the unitive way. It is likely that a considerable number of our penitents will be in the purgative way. They are good and believing souls, falling sometimes into mortal sin, but quickly repenting. They must be treated by the Confessor with gentleness and kindness, but with firmness. However tiresome they may sometimes be, the Confessor must never allow himself to appear in a hurry, though he will check anything that tends to be mere waste of time or mere garrulity on the part of the penitent. The direction given should be practical. Sanderson says that the first abuse to notice here is that the priest, after the Confession, sometimes gives a vague and monotonous exhortation which makes the penitent say: "When my Confessor gives me advice he talks as if he were preaching." It is necessary to get to much closer quarters with the penitent and to make the direction suitable to the special needs of each person. For souls in this stage you will recommend vocal prayer and meditation; a fight against the dominant defect with, probably, the use of a particular self-examination, and a frequent use of the Sacraments—probably a weekly Communion. A good many of our penitents rest stationary here. Their intentions are excellent, but they never seem able to escape from at least an occasional lapse into

mortal sin. To help them here we may perhaps steal some advice from modern psychologists. They tell us that the maintenance and the recovery of bodily health are far more matters of the imagination than of the will. If a person says, "I will get better," that at once creates a strong suggestion that he is not getting better, and this suggestion prevails. Let him, on the other hand, believe that he is getting better and improvement follows. The same, I think, is true in the realm of the spiritual and the moral. One person says, "I shall never entirely conquer that sin"; another, "I shall never learn to meditate"; and they never will as long as these suggestions dominate the mind. The Confessor must set himself to break down such mischievous beliefs; he must build up in the soul a confidence in its own powers, for once a person believes he can do a thing, and is doing it, the battle is half won. Probably the greatest Confessors are those with the priceless power to instil into their penitents such a belief. Some, like St. Philip Neri, seem to have it naturally, just as there are some doctors who make you feel you are better directly they enter the sick-room. But we can all do something in this direction once we know that the seat of the inability lies in the imagination and nowhere else.

In the next stage, that of the illuminative way, you find fervent souls who have taken a great step in advance. Mortal sin no longer appears in their Confessions, though they may be, and probably are, very weak still with regard to venial sins. I believe that in our congregations there are always a fair number who have reached this stage, and others who, with wise direction, might attain it. It is in this stage that you will probably find the passage from meditative to affective prayer. Affective prayer is not contemplative, though it is a station on the way to it. It is like a meditation with hardly any consideration, but with a great use made of the affections. The Confessor, here, will take great pains to teach the soul to be recollected, to be, that is, in such a state of mind that the thought of God will never be far from the surface. To live with a continual apprehension of the presence of God is possible, not only for monks and nuns, but for those living in the world as well. Both men and women living in the world have reached a stage of great recollection and great sanctity. It is in souls in the illuminative way that you will probably find the desire for voluntary mortification beginning to appear. Most of the better known of religious books, such as the *Imitation of Christ* of Thomas à Kempis and the *Introduction to the Devout Life*, by St. Francis de Sales, were written for souls who had reached this stage in their spiritual life. It has been said that if a soul really likes these books and reads them, not only from a sense of duty, but with happy delight, it is a probable sign that he is in the illuminative way. Again, let me beg you not to regard this stage as exceptional and very rarely reached. There are many humble persons in it—clergy, men and women in society, clerks, dressmakers, parlour-maids—but for most of them their attainments are known to none but God and their Confessor.

Lastly, there are the souls who have reached the unitive way. Of these I will say little. They include the really heroic souls and the great saints. This is the time for contemplative prayer. In the earlier stages prayer has been developing more and more and has become less and less of an effort, but for souls in the unitive way prayer ceases to be a particular exercise and becomes an habitual disposition of the soul.

(3) There can be little doubt that most of us, when we come across

souls who are approaching this position, must be ready to hand over the charge to others. But this may often be necessary in much earlier stages. One comes across priests sometimes who are very jealous and cannot bear that anyone else should interfere with their penitents. I have known a priest to count his penitents like a Red Indian counting scalps, and who objected strongly if they ever sought the advice of another. But we must be ready sometimes to encourage them to do this. If the penitent shows the desire himself for another opinion, or if we are a little uncertain of the course to pursue, or a little suspicious we may be treating the case mistakenly, we should recommend that the advice of a specialist be sought, even if it be only by letter from ourselves. You will notice that I take my metaphors from the medical profession. I do this because I think there is a real similarity between the cases. The general practitioner can treat most cases himself, but on occasions a visit to Harley Street is needed. The country doctor knows certain specialists to whom he applies; the men, probably, under whom he formerly studied. It might be well if every priest knew a few spiritual experts to whom he could apply. It would not be always possible to send the penitent to visit the expert, though when it is possible it should be done; but much can be done and is often done by correspondence. It would doubtless be found that many members of our religious orders would be both capable and willing to act as consulting spiritual experts. I have no doubt that a religious is best for this position. Advice, too, will sometimes be needed concerning those who think they may have a vocation to the religious life. I am not referring to those who think they have such a vocation, but say that, owing to home duties, they cannot immediately fulfil it. In such cases there is, I am sure, no call. There is nothing but a vague idea that they would like the life. I do not believe that idea is present in real vocations. Rather, there is a shrinking from the life at first, a belief that the person would never be able to stand it. The Confessor will, however, always be on the look-out for vocations, and he will probably look for them in early youth. When God gives a vocation it is for a life—for the whole of adult life, not for the tail-end of it. As soon as people are old enough to be married they are old enough to become religious. Nor is it the quiet, pious people who are generally called. It is those who have a great zest for life, and for life, too, in the world—the Diana Vernons rather than the ladies of Cranford. We are certainly not producing nearly enough vocations for the religious life, and this must be, at least in part, the fault of Confessors. How many of us are really on the watch for possible vocations among our younger people?

(4) It is evident, however, that, such is the importance of the work, we ought to strive to make ourselves more competent Confessors. Much, no doubt, comes from experience. Those who are without this should be very careful. With the best intentions in the world they may make great mistakes. A man, if he is to be a competent Confessor, must study. He should surely, both in his own interests and in the interests of his penitents, make a comprehensive study of the interior life. Probably he would do best here to devote himself to a thorough intensive study of some great book, say Father Baker's *Holy Wisdom* or Poulain's *Graces of Interior Prayer*, reading it slowly and reading it more than once. If a book of this kind is worth reading at all it is worth reading with the greatest thoroughness. Once more, it is sometimes helpful to study the direction of one man. It might be St. Francis de Sales. If you read

the *Introduction to the Devout Life*, the book on the Love of God, and the four volumes of his correspondence, you will get a very good general idea how he treated his cases, from those souls like Mme. de Chantal down to the less advanced souls who applied to him for advice. The same might be done with the correspondence of Fénelon. The result of becoming familiar with the methods of either of these two great directors would help us to become more competent Confessors or directors ourselves. Or you can study the treatment of some fault—scrupulosity, for example, or depression—in a number of writers on spirituality. By noticing where they agreed and where they differed you would certainly be on the way to become a more efficient guide yourself.

Perhaps you will say that all I have done is to make a few suggestions about the methods to be adopted in order to make a pious, middle-aged spinster a little more pious. I know that to some, perhaps to many, it will seem an unattractive work compared with the startling conversion of sinners or with preaching to congregations of intelligent men and women. It will be despised by the outsider and will gain no praise from the man of the world. But our parochial work is really based on those lines of prayer, and the more we can cultivate the spirit of prayer in our parishes the better it will be. Nowhere can we be good shepherds more perfectly than in the ministry of the Sacrament of Penance. There are many dark Confessionals in our churches which stir the imagination because they have been the theatres of wonderful dramas of the soul. Some have left them full of the most amazing happiness and joy and feeling strangely light of heart because of the burden that is left behind. Others have gone away excited by the new light that has been thrown on their progress in prayer. Another has left with almost terrifying thoughts of an unsuspected vocation beginning to germinate in the mind. Let us never complain of the time spent in the Confessional, and never speak lightly or contemptuously of our penitents.

G. C. Rawlinson.

SACRAMENTAL RELIGION

"Sacramental religion" is a convenient phrase to use for describing the kind of religion which is believed in and practised by those who love the name of "Catholic." But for us it means a great deal more than "a religion which uses sacraments." The vast majority of Christians, indeed, believe that our Lord instituted sacraments and intended them to be used. Catholics, however, believe that sacraments should be at the centre of religion as the principal means of grace round which all our devotional experience should gather. We hold that the religious habits and outlook of most of our fellow-countrymen are gravely "unsacramental," to their great loss. The sacraments may be accepted and occasionally used. But they are

treated as accessories, more or less accidental and unimportant in the practice of religion. This is mainly due to the Puritan tradition and the Puritan way of looking at things, to which we stand opposed. The difference between Catholic and Puritan goes deep. It is not merely a question of the right meaning of texts of Scripture or of the value of this or that ceremony. Here we have two opposite ways of regarding not only religion, but the whole of life. Let us then try to see why we are sacramentalists and why we cannot accept the unsacramental view of religion.

On our view of things our Lord's institution of the Sacraments was in no sense incidental. It was deliberately designed as part of a divine scheme which is as wide as the world and as old as Creation. God has made us human beings with a two-fold nature. We are composed of body and soul, partly material and partly spiritual. With this double nature God has set us in a world of material things, which we can touch and see and feel through our bodily senses; but He has also made us conscious of another world, spiritual and invisible, like the soul of man. To both these worlds we belong and we cannot ignore either one or the other. We must live our daily life in the body; yet that life depends upon God who is Spirit; and to know Him we must enter into the spiritual world where angels and blessed spirits are at home. God made us in His own likeness for this purpose; yet He did not make us, like angels, without bodies. He might have made us purely spiritual like them; but He did not see fit to do so, and for this He must have had good reason. It follows from this that the religion most suitable for our human nature and its needs will be one which takes account of the body as well as the soul; which has its material and visible side as well as speaking to us of things spiritual and invisible. There never has been nor can be any such thing as a purely spiritual religion in this life. The body and the soul are not enemies to one another; they are partners by God's design. This is true of all our daily life and experience, and it must therefore be true of religion also. The soul is to be helped through the body, rather than in spite of it. Moreover, not only the body but the whole visible world around us may be yoked to the service of religion if we will have it so. "God saw everything that He had made and behold it was very good." "Nothing is common or unclean." Everything has a religious significance if only we have eyes to see it. All the poets tell us that; and the overwhelming verdict of religion is on the same side. So St. Paul says: "The invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and

divinity." For us the world itself is a kind of sacrament, something visible and material which helps us to the knowledge of spiritual things. For a sacrament, as the Catechism says, is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace."

Sacramental religion, then, takes account of all these facts and is therefore the only kind of religion which can meet the needs of our human nature. In fact, it may truly be said that until fairly recent times it is the only kind of religion which mankind has known. All the great religions of the old world were sacramental in this sense. For God left not Himself without witness, and though no man by searching can find out God, yet so far as they went they were right in seeking God in this way. So when God gave a special revelation of Himself to Israel, He carried on the same method. The religion of the Bible is sacramental and Catholic through and through. Thus in the Old Testament whole books are given up to the description of the tabernacle and its furniture, the sacrifices, and other rites and ceremonies which belong to the material side of religion. The Jews had their sacraments, such as Circumcision and the Passover. The Temple and the priesthood, with an elaborate sacrificial worship, were at the centre of their religion. Quite subordinate to these were the meeting-houses for prayer, preaching, and reading of Scripture. Here we have sacramental religion. Rites and ceremonies are not merely used as the Protestant uses sacraments. They occupy the centre of the picture and give tone and colour to all else. When abuses crept in and men lost sight of the spiritual realities which these things were intended to express, then came prophets and reformers who (wiser than some Christian reformers) did not destroy but purged the old religion. Some of the prophets were themselves priests and as such knew the needs of the human heart. They built again upon the old foundations; and they built to such good purpose that the old idolatries passed away, and in the purer atmosphere of the second Temple a strong sacramental religion survived the storms of centuries until the fullness of time had come. These are facts beyond dispute. The Old Testament is a Catholic book, and it would be well if Catholics took more interest in it than often they seem to do. But what bearing has it on the New Testament?

Here I would ask you to notice some very important conclusions which scholars have reached on this subject, conclusions of the greatest interest to Catholics. Some of us were once taught to believe that our Lord deliberately swept away all the great Catholic framework of the old Jewish religion and substituted for it something entirely new, a spiritual religion such as the best of the prophets (we were told) had really wanted

all along. The rationalistic form in which this idea was taught not long ago may now be said to have definitely broken down. It represented a grotesque misreading of the New Testament. Our Lord, indeed, denounced empty formalism and artificiality; but nowhere in His teaching do we find Him depreciating sacramental religion as such, although we might surely have expected Him to do so if He had disapproved of it, seeing that it was the only kind of religion known to His contemporaries. Our Lord came not to destroy but to fulfil. All through His earthly life He was most careful to conform to the institutions of Jewish religion, and in this the early Church followed His example as long as the Temple stood. When we turn to St. Paul we find the same drift of opinion in the Catholic direction. For centuries St. Paul has been held up to us as the father of the Reformation. But now on all hands scholars are admitting that he was a high sacramentalist and a Catholic. We have the same acknowledgment about the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of St. John. It is not only that the writers of the New Testament take a high view of the Church and the Sacraments. Their whole way of regarding religion must be called sacramental. So we pass with no break of tradition to the Fathers of the early Church. To the latter the English Church has always made a special appeal, and there is no doubt that their writings are soaked in the sacramental view of religion. With that fact Richard Hooker, the greatest English divine of the Reformation period, was well acquainted. He is the real father of the Anglo-Catholic theology of the past three centuries, and upon no point can we appeal to his authority with more confidence than upon this of the supreme importance and value of sacramental religion and its approval by the best mind of the Church.

But there is one fact of greater importance than any that has yet been mentioned, which should really determine our whole attitude to this question—the fact of the Incarnation. Our Lord Himself, the Creator of all things visible and invisible, has entered this visible world of ours. He has taken upon Him our flesh that He might make our earthly experience His own. He made both the flesh which He took and the earth which is its home; for both are His, and He came to redeem both with all that belongs to them:

> "Flesh sinned and Flesh hath cleansed the stain,
> And in the Flesh High God doth reign."

With human hands and voice He instituted His Sacraments, just as with the same hands and voice He healed men's bodily diseases and multiplied earthly food for the hungry multitudes. All these facts have an inner connection with one another and

they are all sacramental. On the other hand, there is a most dangerous doctrine which has repeatedly attacked the Catholic religion in different forms because of these same facts. It says that the material world is evil, that the human body cannot really be redeemed, and that in consequence religion is only concerned with the soul and is purely spiritual. It is obvious that on such a view there can be no value in sacraments. But very much more is involved than that. This specious doctrine of a false spirituality gives the direct lie to our Lord's Incarnation. Naturally, also, it can find no place for a resurrection of the body, either of His or ours. If it has not always gone the full length of its principles, that does not make the doctrine less dangerous; for ultimately it undermines elementary morality and cuts the nerve of religion. This poison has always been at work to some extent in the Puritan view of life. But its victims go to much more wild extremes to-day, and all who depreciate the sacramental view of religion play straight into their hands. For our Lord's Incarnation is the greatest Sacrament of all, the source of all the Church's Sacraments, from which alone their virtue comes. In that great mystery invisible Godhead was united to a human soul and to a visible material body; and the sufferings of that sacred body were the outward means through which His Divine Love embraced us sinners and procured our salvation.

In instituting sacraments our Lord made provision that this should be the normal working method of the Christian religion. Thus, for Catholics, the Christian life begins in the waters of Baptism and closes its earthly pilgrimage strengthened by the last Sacraments of the dying. At each stage of the journey the soul is equipped for its needs by some appropriate sacrament. At the centre of the whole system is the sacramental worship of the Altar, and thus all the most crucial acts and experiences of our religious life have a sacramental character.

It is natural that, in a religion which gives such a prominent place to bodily acts and the use of material things, not only the Sacraments themselves but the whole outward expression of religion and especially of worship should be considered a matter of great importance. Herein lies the significance of all Catholic ceremonial and of the varied forms which Catholic devotion takes. These are the means by which we try to express great spiritual realities. Where they are neglected or used in a slipshod, careless way, these spiritual realities are left more or less unexpressed or inadequately realized, and souls suffer corresponding loss. Here, again, let us notice an important point. In all this outward expression of religion, which the use of sacraments involves, details are of very varying importance,

and we need to have a sense of proportion. But it would be a great mistake to conclude that, because some practices are *in themselves* of less importance than others, we may therefore dismiss these lesser things from our minds as altogether unworthy of our attention. Such a course would be profoundly out of keeping with the ordinary conduct of all sensible people. The whole of life is made up of little things, for the most part trivial in themselves, such as the great mass of our social customs and conventions. Yet we know well that we cannot afford to neglect these things. Taken together, they have a cumulative effect in creating an atmosphere. They set the stage and provide a background for things greater than themselves. Now wherever in life we recognize and acknowledge these facts, as we all do to some extent, we are so far taking the sacramental view of things. We are acknowledging that things, small in themselves, have none the less some spiritual significance; and that unless we pay attention to these the bigger things will probably not receive their due either.

We may, then, define true sacramental religion by saying that it is something which makes its appeals to the whole of our many-sided human nature. We are all different, and the appeal will come in a variety of ways. Yet, if it is to meet our needs, it will show some sort of correspondence with the laws which govern human life and the working of the human mind. Now of recent years there has been a great advance of scientific knowledge over this very question of the way in which our minds work; and this will probably have a great effect upon our religious practices. It is, perhaps, hardly too much to say that, as this new learning has already transformed educational theories and is quickly leavening other departments of life, so too it is already undermining many old-fashioned ideas about practical religion. It is very likely that it may provide a new vindication of those sacramental ways and habits for which Catholics have always contended. The religion which centres in Bible-reading and preaching, leaving the Sacraments in a subordinate position, is one which does violence to our nature; for it gives an exaggerated and isolated importance to a bare work of the intellect and thus hampers the free movement of other parts of the mind, such as the imagination, which really possess a much more penetrating power. In this way men have largely lost the sense of spiritual mystery, which is so vastly important to true religion. We are content to live on the surface of things and to cling to the ways of what we call "common sense," which is often another word for "commonplace." Our senses, our imagination, and often our emotions have been treated as enemies to be suppressed by force of will as though

they were too depraved to be used in the service of religion. Such an attitude leaves men a ready prey to rationalism in their beliefs and ties them down to narrow conventions of respectability in the affairs of daily life. Of all this the new psychology is making hay. For it tells us that we possess a vast inheritance of instinct which is perpetually reacting to its surroundings. We cannot uproot it; but we can train it for the highest service by a right use of the imagination. Through the gates of our five senses a continual stream of messages is coming into our minds from the world around. If these lay hold of our imagination, they will have a tremendous power of suggestion which will dominate and control the will. But many things are competing together to influence our minds, and those alone will prevail which can succeed in capturing our imagination. The practical world around us has long been learning these facts. Every teacher to-day knows that a child must be taught through the eye as well as the ear; for pictures grip the imagination. Business men and caterers for pleasure well understand this and act upon it—witness our advertisements, newspapers, and places of entertainment. All the world has learnt the power of suggestion, and only religion lags behind. "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." But why should the world be allowed to have its way with some of the greatest forces in human life, while religion stands aloof as though it had nothing to do with these things? The world is God's world and has been redeemed by Christ. He took the common elements of bread and wine and made them to be His Body and Blood; and this was but natural in Him who had taken upon Him the lowly form of a servant in the simplicity of Bethlehem and made it the shrine of His Godhead. As He raised that lowly nature of ours, made His, to the throne of heaven, so we greet and honour that same lowliness of His when He draws near to us in the simplicity of broken Bread. But as He has honoured us, so we must needs try to honour Him and surround His Presence in the Mass with all the outward marks which befit His royal majesty.

Simplicity and sovereign dignity are attributes of God. But religion will also bring them into the humblest human lives; and for this the Sacraments were given to us. They are so simple that a child can understand them and use them, and yet they bring us face to face with unspeakable mysteries of evangelical love. In them God puts forth His Hand to touch us, and through them we may learn to answer that touch with the simplicity of faith and the reverence of love. They are joyful rites, for where God is there is joy; and through them the Holy Spirit works to bring forth His blessed fruits of love,

joy, peace, and all Christian living. They are majestic rites, for through them God's sacred majesty works, requiring of us and calling out from us habits of repentance, sincerity, obedience, and a serious purpose. They are for all without distinction. The poor and unlettered can understand them. Children love them, when they are brought to them early; and the earlier the better. They have a right to receive the Sacraments before they have to face the difficulties of puberty and adolescence. For if they can learn, as they will readily do, to form a habit of using the Sacraments some time before the real battle of life begins, then there is good hope that they may continue. A child will make his first confession more simply and naturally in his time of innocence than he will ever do in later years. So too with the other Sacraments—Confirmation and Holy Communion. To learn the way of the Sacraments is to learn the way to love God and to abide in His love. The Sacraments are also for sinners—for all who feel the burden of sin and desire to escape its power; not for a few select spirits who are naturally religious, but for the average man or woman who knows how hard it is to be good and is tempted to despair and to give up. For the poor and simple, the child and the penitent: we are all poor in spiritual treasure and unworthy of God's gifts; yet we are all His children and only need the faith of a child to enter into the Kingdom. This faith we shall win most surely by learning to depend upon the grace which is most freely offered to us in Christ's holy Sacraments.

L. S. Thornton.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH

Why is it that men dispute concerning Sacraments? It is chiefly because they hold different theories concerning Grace. Also because they differ whether the Sacraments convey Grace or not. Therefore, it is essential to consider what Grace is understood to mean.

1. Concerning Grace, two doctrines have prevailed. One is that Grace means God's kindly disposition; the other that it means the gift of supernatural strength. In the former doctrine, Grace represents a quality in God; in the latter a power imparted to men. Let us call these different doctrines the first and the second, and confine attention, to begin with, to the first—that is, that Grace is simply divine benevolence.

If Grace simply means God's favour, and nothing more, it follows that Sacraments are only signs of that favour. They are pictures, indications, intellectual reminders, of God's

goodness. They are appeals to sentiment and emotion. They represent God's favour. They declare His kindness. But they convey no gift. Clearly, if that is held to be the case, the value of the Sacraments depends on their impressiveness. So long as they appeal to the memory or to the imagination, they will be highly esteemed. But suppose them less impressive than a Gospel lesson or a sermon. Then they will naturally be regarded as inferior in importance. And if their impressiveness should altogether cease, then they will be considered superfluous to spiritual experience. They may even be rejected as mere externalism, or as positive hindrances to religious life. Now this estimate of Sacraments as mere signs is one of the original types of Protestant thought. Protestantism has always been inclined to place an inferior value on them. Contrasts have been continually drawn between the relative importance of a sermon and a Sacrament. Protestantism has frequently argued on some such line as this: Is the sermon indispensable? Yes, for you cannot be saved without a knowledge of the Gospel truth. Is a Sacrament indispensable? No, for it only represents what you already possess. The popular religion which frequented sermons and avoided Sacraments must be founded on some such theory as this. Let me give some illustrations:

(1) A distinguished historian,* member of the Society of Friends, admits that the Quakers are "always liable to the reproof that we are acting contrary to the written instructions of the great General, though we venture to think it is not so, and that we have the mind of Christ in bearing this hard testimony against the materialization of spiritual truth which the Catholic teaching on this subject involves." In his opinion "the outward symbol would have disturbed, rather than deepened, that communion with God in the Spirit which they experience" (*ibid.* p. 351).

(2) While Emerson was still a Unitarian minister he informed his congregation that he had conscientious scruples against administering the Eucharist. "The use of the elements, however suitable to the people and the modes of thought of the East, where it originated, is foreign and unsuited to affect us. The day of formal religion is past" (O. W. Holmes, *Life of Emerson*, p. 57). "It could not be a duty to commemorate Christ by a certain form, whether this form be acceptable to their understanding or not" (*ibid.* p. 59). The congregation objected and Emerson resigned. But if the Sacrament is nothing more than he supposed, the minister was more logical than his people.

* *Life of T. Hodgkin*, p. 272.

(3) Very earnest attempts have been made by Protestants to protect the Sacraments from evaporation of their religious worth. Some thirty years ago the distinguished Congregational minister, Dr. Dale of Birmingham, was painfully conscious that the great majority of Congregationalists regarded the Eucharist as nothing more than an instructive picture, an object-lesson setting forth the sacrifice of Christ, an appeal to the emotions. "With such conceptions Dale was dissatisfied. He felt that the theory had been developed under hostile influences, and that most of those who accepted it had been forced into that position by anxiety to avoid giving any advantages to doctrines with which they were in conflict. In their eagerness to secure a scientific frontier they had abandoned large provinces of truth" (*Life of Dale*, p. 359). Accordingly Dr. Dale, at the request of the Congregational Union, composed his Manual of Congregational Principles in which he called on his co-religionists to restore neglected truths about the Sacraments. His doctrine represented an extremely moderate return to Calvinist ideas. He held that Baptism does not create a new relation between Christ and the baptized. It only affirms a relationship which already exists. It declares, it assures, but it does not confer. It corresponds to a coronation. "Kings are not made by being crowned: they are crowned because they are kings." Similarly "in the Lord's Supper Christ communicates to the Church whatever is represented by the Bread and Wine." But "the material elements are only symbols." They "represent a real transfer of power like the surrender of the key of a city." This view of the Sacraments was indeed extremely moderate, but it proved too much for the Congregationalism of thirty years ago. The Union found it advisable to issue the Manual in two forms, in one of which the sacramental doctrine was entirely left out.

These illustrations make one think. If Grace means no more than favour, and a Sacrament only represents what it does not convey, so that its value depends upon its impressiveness, and that impressiveness is small, it will always be difficult to secure the perpetual observance of the sign, especially where men credit themselves with possessing already that favour of God which the sign merely represents. Not even the fact that it is divinely commanded will secure its perpetuation. It will always seem reasonable to say that if you possess the substance you can dispense with the shadow; that religion consists in inward spirituality and not in outward forms; that Christ's command can be broken in the letter and yet observed in the spirit. Given the Quaker's view of a Sacrament, and their independence of Sacraments is the most thoroughgoing and consistent form of the Protestant spirit.

Let us now investigate the Scripture doctrine concerning Grace.

The primary meaning of Grace in Scripture is unquestionably *divine favour* or benevolence. It denotes a quality in the character of God. "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" means His goodness and loving-kindness. But this benevolence is displayed in deeds. St. Paul says: "Ye know the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich yet for your sakes He became poor." Here the divine favour shows itself in action. And that action is the Incarnation. Hence, Grace, which originally denoted God's character, goes further and means *God's gift.* For the purpose of the Incarnation was not merely to appeal to us from without, but to infuse power within. The Son of God became man in order not only to work externally to us, on our behalf, to instruct and reveal and make reparation and plead; but He became man in order to impart through that human nature, when glorified, the spiritual forces which our feebleness requires. The Incarnation is expressly in order to work within our souls. "He breathed on them, and saith, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Consequently, Grace is primarily a quality in the heart of God, becomes ultimately a power in the heart of man.

And this doctrine exactly corresponds with human requirements. For the greatest defect in human nature is not ignorance but weakness. When we know the right, we fail to do it. The famous confession, "The good I would I do not; the evil that I would not that I do," is the universal experience. No mere appeal from without can enable us. What our weakness demands is the power of God within. Paul may plant, Apollos water, but nothing happens unless God gives the increase. "It is God that worketh in us both to will and to do." So St. Paul can say: "By the Grace of God I am what I am: and His Grace which was bestowed upon me was found vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I but the Grace of God which was with me." That is the Apostolic experience. Grace working in him; strengthening his will, identified with his actions; so that character is the product of the co-operation of God and man: "I, yet not I, but the Grace of God which was with me." Conscious as he is of weakness in himself, yet, when Grace is given, he is filled with power. "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." Seldom, if ever, has a sentence been written more fully representing the Pauline teaching than Augustine's famous words: "Give grace to do what Thou commandest, and then command what Thou wilt."

Grace, then, in the Scripture meaning of the term, is not

simply the divine favour and goodness; it is not merely a quality in God. Nor is it merely God's favour displayed in acts in the outer world. In the full and complete meaning it is the divine imparting of strength, the action of God on the spirit of man within.

Now, if this is the Scripture doctrine of Grace, it is obvious what must be *the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacraments*. They cannot be merely signs. They are not mere ceremonies which represent what they do not convey. They are channels for the communication of what they represent. The two doctrines hold together. If Grace is strength conveyed, the Sacraments will be means for the conveyance of that Grace.

We are told, indeed, by an eminent Presbyterian,* that there are many Protestants who firmly believe that God exerts a direct power by His Spirit on the hearts of men, but who, nevertheless, refuse to say the same about the Sacraments. They do not think that the doctrine that the Sacraments convey Grace is warranted in Scripture. They think it tends to superstition. But if Grace is, as they believe, God's strength bestowed on the human heart, the idea that Christ instituted Sacraments, and yet refused to make them means for the conveyance of that Grace, is a singularly unnatural supposition. For it ascribes to Christ a concern for mere ceremonial representation, which many Protestants feel to be foreign to the inwardness and spirituality of the Christian religion. Calvin himself insisted that God does not mock us with empty signs. But the sign is conjoined to the thing signified. We may add, if Grace is the communication of strength, a Sacrament must be a channel for communicating it. It is a very instructive fact that the latest criticism of the New Testament has come to the conclusion that primitive Christians believed a most intimate connection to exist between the outward Sign and the inward Reality. For the student of religion is becoming increasingly convinced that the modern idea of a sign is exactly the opposite to the ancient idea of the same. The modern idea is that a sign represents something which is not there. But the ancient idea is that a sign is a visible indication of an invisible presence. The sign, in the ancient sense, somehow mysteriously embodies what it represents. There is a very real if indefinable connection between the Sign and the Thing signified.

For example, the Holiest Place, the Sacred House, on the Hill of Sion, did not merely represent the presence of Deity, but God was conceived to be actually there. And the priest who entered must beware of irreverence lest the Lord brake

* Candlish, *The Christian Sacraments*, p. 38.

forth upon him. And the king who entered irreverently was struck with leprosy. For the Sign and the Thing signified were not separate but combined. God was actually there. He dwelleth at Jerusalem.

So Loisy* holds that in the Apostolic view there is no rite which is a merely symbolic and material expression of a belief. It is all alive with reality. Baptism *is* Spirit. Eucharist *is* Christ. They did not speculate in those days about the metaphysical explanation. But the worship of that age was a spiritual realism which knew nothing of such things as mere symbols. The sacramental rite was a vehicle of the Spirit and a medium for the communication of divine life.

It is one of the most remarkable features of modern criticism that its leaders are agreed that St. Paul was a pronounced sacramentalist. In Dr. Forsyth's lectures on the Church and the Sacraments, there is included a lecture by the Free Churchman Professor Andrews, on the place of the Sacraments in the teaching of St. Paul. The Professor refers to some seven eminent German critics, "all of whom," he says, "some of them with extreme reluctance, have come to the decision that the sacramental principle is a vital element in St. Paul's teaching" (p. 144). And this outcome of modern criticism is, as Professor Andrews observes, "all the more significant because it has come from scholars who cannot be suspected of the slightest bias towards sacramentalism." As the same writer remarks, "if there is any sound basis for this new movement, it is perfectly clear that a very serious problem will be raised for the Free Church theology, or at any rate for the section of it which has been in the habit of regarding the Sacraments as merely symbolical" (*ibid.* p. 145). When St. Paul wrote that significant sentence "the Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the Blood of Christ?" the Apostle means that "in some mysterious way the life of God is conveyed into the lip of the worshipper through the medium of the material elements which are consumed" (p. 151). "St. Paul clearly means," says Professor Kirsopp Lake, "that the Corinthians knew quite well that the Eucharist is a rite which really conveys that which the heathen erroneously thought to obtain in their sacrificial meals, that is, participation in the Divine Nature." And the Free Church Professor maintains that the sacramental interpretation of St. Paul "has won a decisive victory" (p. 154). And that consequently the alternative before Protestantism is either "to revise its conception of the Sacraments," or else to say that the sacramental teaching of St. Paul is no genuine part of Christianity, but "is

* Compare Loisy, *L'Evangile et L'Eglise*, p. 226, fourth edition.

one of those alien elements which has filtered into his thought from the atmosphere of the age " (p. 157).

But to say the latter is clearly to say that the Apostolic interpretation of Christian principles is no safe guide for Christian people. And to say this is to throw all Christian principles into confusion and insecurity. The only alternative before men who consent to be guided by the Apostles is that Protestantism must revise its conception of the Sacraments. Many a popular opinion about the Eucharist was framed in a period of reaction from the gross materialism of the Middle Ages. Men thought they never could be so safe from one extreme as when they rushed to the other. They are now awaking to the fact that this extreme also is distant from reality. Theories formulated in an atmosphere unfavourable to impartiality must now be revised in the light of a truer appreciation of the Apostolic teaching.

Surely these ideas are most remarkable. They are the utterances of Lutheran critics and Nonconformist ministers. This movement in Protestantism is a distinct and very wonderful approximation to the Catholic conception of a Sacrament. It is supported by the ablest Biblical criticism of the day. If this movement prevails, Protestant and Catholic will be in closer agreement about the sacramental principle than they have ever been since the Reformation.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

Take your minds back to the days at the end of 1914 and the beginning of 1915 when the call came to defend England. It was then that the best and bravest of our young men, the flower of England, offered themselves willingly. They were conscious of the prompting of a higher part of their nature; something within them urged them to sacrifice.

What was the moving cause ? It was the divinely implanted instinct of sacrifice. Man was made for sacrifice and he cannot resist the appeal of it, and the more it seems to demand of him the less he can withstand it. That is the secret of the attraction of war—it is sacrifice; and to do and die for a great cause is simply the call to men to be true to their own nature.

Whence comes this fundamental and noble instinct of humanity ?

It comes from God, who is very love itself. The very being of God is sacrifice, since sacrifice is the only perfect expression

of love. All through the ages of eternity, God cherished in His Divine Mind the idea of the Sacrifice of His Son.

Man is made in God's image, and the one ineradicable quality of his nature, one in which he is wholly like his Creator, is the instinct of sacrifice.

There is only one sacrifice, the Sacrifice of God in man, but that sacrifice every man offers when he acts by the true promptings of his nature and gives himself for others.

Sacrifice, then, is the eternal mind of God, and because man is God's creature it is wrought into every fibre of our being.

God has made us for Himself, and therefore He has made us for sacrifice.

It follows, then, that without sacrifice there can be no religion —for religion is the link that binds man to God. Sacrifice is an essential feature of revealed religion, and the religious claim of Christianity carries with it the assumption that it possesses some form of sacrifice.

In working practice every religion must have some means by which its adherents can publicly and corporately, as well as individually and personally, express in action the relation in which they stand to God.

In ancient religions man's natural tendency alone leads him to offer gifts to God. All religions have their sacrifice, unless, like Buddhism, they have a pantheistic belief that reduces God to merely a fine name; or, unless, like Mohammedanism and Protestantism, they have mistaken views of the real nature and meaning of sacrifice. It is man's natural approach to God. Sacrifice in its most elementary, as well as its most primitive form, expresses the homage and self-oblation which men owe to God.

It is complicated by sin, but if sin had never happened sacrifice would still have been needed.

With the sense of sin comes in the element of propitiation, and so shedding of blood becomes the most prominent feature. Man has to approach an offended God.

But the original sense of sacrifice is restored when the Blood of Christ is shed once for all. Cleansed by that Blood, man can once more offer himself in creaturely self-oblation to his Maker. And the Christian Sacrifice is the unbloody offering of the Eucharist.

And let me enforce the point that Christianity grew out of, and fulfilled, a sacrificial religion, one in which sacrifice was the central feature of worship by divine institution.

It emerged from the cradle of Judaism in possession of a central and corporate rite, which it regarded as replacing and superseding the Jewish sacrifice—the Holy Eucharist—and it regarded this rite as sanctioned and appointed by God to be a more effective sacrifice by the power of the accomplished

redemption in Christ. "We," says the writer to the Hebrews, "have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle."

What the old sacrifices prefigured, what Christ's death and priesthood make effectual, the Eucharist pleads before God on behalf of Christians, and by the hidden operation of the Holy Spirit effectively applies to individuals.

Our Blessed Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist in a sacrificial atmosphere—at the most solemn part of the Paschal feast. To feed on the bread of God is to partake of the sacrifice. The cup is the cup of the new covenant. The blood is poured out like the blood of the victim at the foot of the altar.

St. Paul compares it with the heathen sacrifices. He speaks of himself as ministering as a priest, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be acceptable. To the Jews it had been said: "Ye shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." St. Peter tells Christians: "Ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a people for God's own possession." St. John says: "Christ has washed us in His own blood and made us a kingdom and priests." So we have the right of approach to God, through the veil—that is, the flesh of Christ—the right to sacrifice. Both Jews and Christians are a people with a sacrificial vocation.

One might trace right down through all the ages of the Church Catholic the conviction and the claim that the Eucharist is a sacrifice.

What is probably the earliest Christian document after the New Testament, the Didache, says: "On the Lord's Day come together and break bread and celebrate the Eucharist, having first confessed your transgressions that our sacrifice may be pure."

Through all the centuries the Eucharist is the Church's Sacrifice; it is offered by a priest; its place is the altar. It is the pure offering foretold by Malachi, which is to be offered in every place among the Gentiles.

East and West alike, wherever the name of Christ is named, there is the Eucharist described and regarded as the perpetual pleading and representation of the one Great Sacrifice of the Lamb once slain.

Every Catholic Liturgy bears its witness, down to our own Book of Common Prayer, which speaks of:

"This our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

The offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" in union with Christ.

"Our bounden duty and service."

Such, then, is the Eucharistic worship of the Catholic Church, undeniably sacrificial.

While the offering of the Holy Sacrifice is the corporate act

of the whole mystical Body of Christ—the Church—and her effective and acceptable oblation of herself and her members to God, it also demands an individual and personal attitude to God.

We can only offer ourselves, our souls and bodies—unworthy as they are—to be a sacrifice, in union with the one great Sacrifice of Christ. We must be in Him and He in us.

On the Cross, once for all He has made the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for sin. What, then, is the relation of the Eucharist to the Cross ?

Our Lord finished His work of Redemption on the Cross.

The Prayer of Consecration emphatically declares that there He made a " full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

But that full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice which can never be repeated is of eternal efficacy.

" Finished " may mean " over and done with." The Sacrifice of Calvary is not over and done with. " We proclaim the Lord's death till He come."

" Finished " may mean completed and ready for work (" our new house is finished "). It is in this sense that Christ's Sacrifice is finished. We can never add to its efficacy. But, again, it is an Eternal Sacrifice. It lives on in the Eucharist inasmuch as in both the same Priest, Jesus Christ, is both the Offerer, though now acting mediately, and the same living Victim, consecrated and marked once for all by a death never to be repeated. The Cross of Calvary was the first real altar the world had ever seen. The Sacrifice of Calvary was the only real sacrifice the world will ever know.

By the sacramental identification of the earthly elements of bread and wine with the imperishable and eternal Humanity of our Lord, the same substantial thing is offered on our altars as was offered on Calvary.

Christ was lifted up once for all on Calvary, that He might be offered for ever on our altars.

It is the continual memorial of the death of Christ, because in it we exhibit before God the living Body and Blood of Christ in a way that bears witness to the fact of His death, though now He is alive for evermore.

We offer His Body and Blood under separate species. So is Jesus Christ openly set forth crucified. We proclaim the Lord's death till He comes again. And in Communion we apply, subject to our repentance and faith, the blessed fruits of that one Sacrifice for sin to ourselves.

But the Eucharist not only is related to the Cross, but also to the heavenly oblation. There in the heavenly sphere Christ fully exercises His mediatorial priesthood, one which has been

consecrated once for all by His death. There He stands as the Lamb once slain; there He witnesses to His death for us; there He pleads His Passion. And through His ministers here on earth we all have our share in His offering, and here below the Eucharist is the counterpart of the heavenly oblation. His death can never be repeated, but it continually needs to be represented, pleaded, and applied both in heaven and on earth.

It is barely fifty years since Dr. Bright wrote his famous hymn, so often on the lips of Catholics, "And now, O Father, mindful of the love." But in that hymn he expressed in winged words the age-long doctrine of Catholic Christendom on the Eucharist Sacrifice:

> . . . Having with us Him who pleads above,
> We here present, we here set forth to Thee
> That only Offering perfect in Thine eyes,
> The One, True, Pure, Immortal Sacrifice.

Let us now review some devotional and practical consequences of the Eucharistic Sacrifice:

1. The inner purport of sacrifice is the surrender of self, of the will, to God. It is only by and in and through the one Sacrifice of Christ that we can do this. In other words, we offer ourselves when we offer Christ, and because He is acceptable to the Father we also are accepted in the Beloved. In every Eucharist the whole Church, living and departed, here and beyond, offers itself to God.

The sacrifice is offered to God the Father primarily, because He is the Creator, and sacrifice is due from the creature to the Creator. It is offered in and through the one Mediator, God the Son, in union with His Perfect Humanity present on our altars under the forms of bread and wine. It is offered by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, who makes the bread and wine to become the Body and Blood of Christ by His quickening energy. So it governs all prayer, which is offered in the same manner to the Blessed Trinity, to the Father, through the Son, by the Holy Spirit.

2. Because of this it is the Great Act of Christian Worship. Not only because it is the one service directly instituted by our Lord, but because it is what it is. It makes our Sunday worship and transforms the Sabbath into Sunday. The Hebrews kept the days as days of Creation in the natural order and rested on the seventh day: but Christians keep the days of redemption, and no day is marked for rest in the Christian week. We have six days for work and one day for worship.

Sunday is the day of resurrection, of renewal in Christ and of sacrificial worship, approach to the Father through and with the Son.

The conception of Sunday as primarily a day of rest is a mistaken one, and has greatly weakened the Christian Church by allowing self-indulgence and self-choosing to be the common temper of religious service.

The duty of public worship at the Holy Sacrifice on the first day of the week is obligatory upon all who call themselves Christians and assert their claim to fellowship with the Risen Christ. Without it the worship of Sunday is incomplete and our "bounden duty and service" not rendered.

And lastly, it is our Sacrifice of Thanksgiving. Its dominant note is joy and gladness. From this it takes its Apostolic title Eucharist. All the rejoicing of the Christian Church circles round it. Her stately cathedrals were built to be the shrines of the Real Presence and to vent the loud cry of the Church's exultation that the tabernacle of God was with men. Her most stately ceremonial, her most glorious hymnody, her most magnificent vestments, have always been devoted to the honour of her Lord and King in the Blessed Sacrament. It is the glory of the Anglo-Catholic Movement that it has done much to restore to the Church of England much of that holy gladness which had been lost in her worship. It is the Eucharist which gathers around itself the joy of the Christian life which springs from the sense of deliverance from sin and union with God. There we are no longer strangers and pilgrims, but fellow-citizens with the saints and the whole household of God. By the new and living way we pass through the veil and come to the heavenly Jesus (above and free and mother of us all); to the innumerable company of the angels, with their anthem "Holy, Holy, Holy"; to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant and the blood of the new covenant voicing no cry for vengeance, like that of Abel, but pleading for our pardon and protection.

It is in this fullness of joy at the Great Sacrifice that the Church sends up her triumphal and glorious pæan to her God:

"We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee. . . . For Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord."

S. R. P. Moulsdale.

CHRIST AND THE SOUL

I.—CONVERSION

What is my personal relationship to Jesus Christ? That is the question stirred in our hearts as we begin to think of Conversion. His personal relationship to us—His coming in the flesh, His manifestation in the flesh in word and deed and life; His personal oblation for us; His personal provision for our

complete redemption in the gift of the Spirit, in the constitution of His Holy Church, and in the appointment of the means of grace; His gift of Himself to us now, even as once He made the gift of Himself for us—all this has passed before us more or less in this Congress. What is now our personal relationship to Him? That is the question that must pursue us just in proportion as we really begin to think steadily, honestly, unflinchingly on what it means to be a Christian—on what it means to be a Catholic. That is, as we begin to think how God has acted towards us, we cannot remain passive. That would be to be unblessed indeed; it is to be "nigh unto cursing";* it is to be rejected wholly.

The rain that falls on the sands of the seashore passes through them. There is no response, no capacity of response. It passes through into the sea or into the waters that ultimately find their way into the sea, and is received up again into the clouds that will fall one day afresh in new showers upon some fruitful soil. The fruitful soil receives and retains the moisture. It enters into the plants. It is found in leaf and blossom and fruit.

What is our response to God's gift of Himself to us in Jesus Christ? The only adequate response is the gift of ourselves to God in Jesus Christ. That is the work, the achievement of our conversion; and the gift of ourselves means that we have begun to confess that "Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father,"† Lord in Himself, maker and heir of all things; Lord of the universe without and of the Church within; Lord of life and Lord of grace; Lord of my whole being, of my mind, my heart, and my will; Lord of my inmost being; Lord of my outer life.

Some of you will remember those words in the opening of a great sermon with which Père Lacordaire began to speak about our Lord Jesus Christ in the Cathedral of Paris:‡

"Lord Jesus, for ten years I have spoken of Thy Church to this auditory. It is, indeed, of Thee that I have always spoken, but now and more directly I come to Thyself, to those divine features which are the daily object of my contemplation, to Thy sacred feet which I have so often kissed, to Thy divine hands which have so often blessed me; to Thy forehead crowned with glory and with thorns, to that life whose sweetness I have respired from my birth, which my youth disregarded, which my manhood regained, which my riper age adores and proclaims to every creature. O Father, Master, Friend! O Jesus, second me now more than ever, since being closer to Thee it is meet that my hearers should perceive it, and that the words

* Heb. vi. 8. † Phil. ii. 11. ‡ Conferences of Jesus Christ.

which fall from my lips should manifest the nearness of Thy adorable presence."

Which, indeed, may God grant us now in mind and heart and will!

(1) God calls us to be His. In the familiar words of the Catechism, it is my duty to "believe in Him, to fear Him and to love Him with all my mind and with all my heart and with all my soul and with all my strength." That is a faith which gathers up together and calls upon all the faculties and powers of my being, and expresses itself in a worship of praise, of prayer, of attention, of obedience, a worship that is a real oblation of ourselves, placed at His disposal to be fashioned to His will, and to be used for His purposes. This is the true ideal of human life, its true fulfilment in its relation to God. It is myself that God wants, not my work, not my time—how much less my half-time, or my off-time—not my benevolence, not my patronage. It is myself that God wants, the personality that understands and is touched, that responds, that yields itself, that co-operates—yes, the personality that understands and is touched and receives what He would give; that being blessed loves, gives thanks, offers itself, is ready to do and to dare and to suffer. Work, time, goods all become His, when we are His. Then we only seek beneath all to live unto God, through all to live for God, in all to live in God.

Now, these things would be true of any genuine religious faith in those who were its true professors, but how much more must they be characteristic and supremely evident in the Christian faith and those who profess it? For here is a revelation of God and a gift of Himself which beget an illumination of the mind, a kindling of the heart, and a demand upon the will which can have no parallel elsewhere. This was the difference which became manifest in the conversion of St. Paul. He had served God as a Jew conscientiously all his days, but to live conscientiously is not the same as being converted. It is not enough to live according to our own conscience. Our conscience must be awake and responding to the revelation of God. We must have a good conscience—that is, one that answers to the truth. Therein lies, indeed, the truly converted life.

When Saul was converted—as he himself describes it—it was first of all an illumination. "God, who commanded light to shine out of darkness, shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."* He came to a new faith. The obsessions, the prejudices, the darkness of the mind were done away with. Before the brightness of this vision of Jesus in His glory, and the inmost sounding

* 2 Cor. iv. 6.

of the voice, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," he gained knowledge. That was the first step to his conversion. The mind was illuminated with the truth.

But it was also an appeal, a kindling of the heart. "Why persecutest thou Me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." How wonderful is this love of God for the creature, the work of His hands! There is no complaint of the injury that the Lord was suffering; there is only the compassion that reached out to seek to touch the inmost heart of the sinning creature. "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." So he sought and found mercy. "I obtained mercy," he writes long after to Timothy, his son in the faith, "and for this cause, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering for a pattern to them that should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting."* He gained knowledge; he sought and received mercy, and it issued in an irresistible demand. As he writes to Timothy about it in this very place he cannot help bursting out into the Doxology: "Now unto the King immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever." But this was because he had made his immediate surrender: "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" It was a very little thing that he was told to do. It seemed to have very little bearing for the moment on his conversion. It was only: "Go into Damascus, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."† But the reality, the fruit, the truth of his conversion, was secured because he obeyed the command that came forth. When we obey God we are on the way of life.

From that time forward he says: "The life that I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me."‡ From that time he is Paul, the bond-servant of Jesus Christ. Christ his Lord leads him in His procession of triumph throughout the world. He is no more his own. And his account of it is—"I was enlightened; I received mercy; I belong body and soul to Him."

(2) Now this is the common inheritance of every Christian. It should be our common experience; it should be our evident character. If it is not, then it is conversion that we need, that arresting upon our path, that enlightening of our understanding, that conviction of Christ and of our sin which touches the depths of our hearts, that confession of Him and surrender to Him that were the very heart of St. Paul's conversion. That is what we are all needing. We are not so shy of the word "conversion" as at one time Catholics, or perhaps I ought to say sober Church of England people, used to be. We know that it means the turning of our whole being from sin and the

* 1 Tim. i. 16. † Acts ix. 6. ‡ Gal. ii. 20.

world and self—from love of sin, love of the world, and love of self—to Christ, to God in Christ. Conversion has been often confined to an emotional experience in which men felt intensely their sins and their guilt, and realized intensely that Jesus had borne their sins and atoned for their guilt. This, indeed, is a tremendous experience, an experience that if it is allowed its way in the soul must transform the character. But it is not true of all people in the same way, and its essence and its value are not in its emotional character as expressed in sensible tokens. The stirring of the emotions is an immense force, but it must express itself in the will if it is to have a true and permanent effect. The value of this experience lies in the vision it gives of God, and in the opportunity which it gives to ourselves to receive a new grace and go forward in a new path. We receive great gifts not that we may rest in our consciousness of receiving them, but that through them we may rise to the giver, from self to God. Only when that is accomplished, only when Christ is truly Lord, does He become fully Saviour.

True conversion, then, is the awaking within us of a living faith. God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, become a living reality to us—that is, the reality of a living person in relationship with ourselves. God indeed only becomes real to us as we apprehend Him as alive to us. We only become real persons, with the reality that God meant us to have, when we become alive to God. And then we go on from faith to faith.

This conversion, with its illumination, with its kindling, with its appeal, grows and develops within us as God in His nature and being, in His gifts and in His works, in His calls and in His inspirations, is revealed more and more within us in Christ by His Spirit. But the condition of growth is our obedience at every stage to the call. It is as we obey, as we respond to what we behold, as we are obedient, St. Paul would have said, to "the heavenly vision";* it is as we acknowledge the truth and love revealed, and begin to surrender ourselves to the claim they make upon us, that we become capable of advance, and capable of fresh revelation. God will communicate Himself to His friends, and we must enter upon this intimacy with God, ere we can receive His truly intimate revelations.

Now, in a Christian child the consciousness of God, of Jesus, and of the Holy Spirit, may develop from the beginning without let or hindrance. The consciousness of God, of Jesus, of the Spirit, will reduce to their true sphere competing claims—claims of the world in its beauty or delight, claims of affection for family or for friends—competing claims which are not evil,

* Acts xxvi. 19.

which in their right order are true and to be acknowledged. And the Christian child will equally reject conflicting claims, claims that are inconsistent with a Christian profession, instantaneously, instinctively, with the instincts of grace. No conversion, strictly so called, is needed there; only a growing illumination, a growing revelation of love and grace and truth, a growing experience of love, a growing response of love, a growing surrender of self. But where competing claims have taken first place in the life, where—more sadly still—claims that conflict with the supremacy of the Lord Jesus within us have taken possession, then the revelation of the Christ to the soul means simple conversion. First things must become first within our hearts, and the second things must have second place, and conflicting claims must be renounced. Sin must be cast out. Repentance in both these cases must have its full work, and repentance is the fruit of a true conversion, so that the revelation of Christ may become supreme in thought and will and life. Thenceforth you will serve Him. Often, I think I ought to say always, it will be with difficulty and conflict, often it may be with relapse, but always with perseverance, with quick return, with ever-renewed loyalty and fresh surrender.

Seek—that the revelation may be complete—Christ in His wonderful fullness of grace and truth. Often, like Saul, we seek to serve God with a good conscience so far as we are aware of His claims upon us; but as those claims become clearer and fuller and more absolute in their demand, then our conscience becomes enlightened, and we must do the things we see. We must act as God moves us, or the vision becomes blurred, and the movement of the Spirit deadened within us. That is why we must begin to make a practical and immediate response. That is the condition of advance. Seek the revelation in its fullness, but let it work in you as it comes to you an immediate response. Do not wait for something further. God will not judge you for what you have not yet received. God will judge according to what a man has, and not according to what he hath not. But let it issue, this new light in you, this new grace in you, let it issue in a practical and immediate response. Thus you will begin to pray. If you have merely said formal prayers and you have become dissatisfied with them, you cast away your form. You lay it down. You come to God in Christ by the Spirit. You pray from your heart. Or you see your sins afresh, and you see the provision made for penitent sinners by our Lord in His Church; you have come to see the truth about confession. Make it.

Your Communion—last night you heard of it—the way of our conversion is to say: "Yes, I am going to prepare for next

Sunday"—an immediate act. Or you become conscious of your need of a rule of life, and you see that you must set up for yourself some guard against the sin that besets you. Set it up at once. That is the sign of your conversion. You become conscious of duties neglected at home. Face the duty. Take up the responsibility to your family, to your servant, to your neighbour.

And do not be afraid to give an outward expression to the new inward life. Remember the splendid story St. Augustine tells us about the conversion of Victorinus, the well-known professor of rhetoric,* "the instructor of so many noble Senators," who had had a statue put up to him in the Roman Forum for his public services. St. Augustine was still a heathen, and he had gone to consult the aged Simplicianus, the teacher and friend and father of St. Ambrose, and to ask for a solution of his difficulties, and Simplicianus began to tell him the story of Victorinus: how Victorinus, the great rhetorician, now aged, would come to Simplicianus and say: "You know I am a Christian, I search the Scriptures, I am a Christian in heart; I am a real Christian already." And Simplicianus used to answer: "Never will I believe that you are a Christian until I see you inside the church." And Victorinus would reply: "Do walls, then, make a Christian?" And so they would constantly speak, and always Victorinus would answer in his half-jest: "Do walls, then, make a Christian?"—going into a church! Until at last one day Victorinus came to Simplicianus and called as usual, but he had come with a new spirit, and he said to his revered friend: "Let us go to-day together into the church; I wish to be made a Christian"—and so his instruction began. He had taken the step that was on the high road of Jesus Christ. By-and-by he was ready for his baptism, and he must make the confession of faith, and they said to him: "Would you wish to say the Creed in private?" He said, "No, I used not to be ashamed to utter my own words before the multitude. Why should I be ashamed to utter the faith of Jesus Christ before the people?" And as he stood there making his profession of faith—I suppose in the words of the Creed—the shout went up all round, a low murmur of surprise at first, and then a cry of rapture: "Victorinus, Victorinus!"

Do the necessary public act. Christ, indeed, may within you by His Spirit assure you that you are His servant, His child, His friend; but confess Him openly.

(3) Always in our conversion it will be Christ first, Christ last, and Christ all the way. Christ first, for we must receive Him. So often we are too proud to receive, too proud to kneel, too

* St. Augustine's *Confessions*, book viii., chapter 2.

proud to express our utter emptiness; but we can do nothing until we have received Jesus Christ; and we must receive Him in the way in which he calls us to receive Him afresh from time to time. Christ received; and served, adored and praised, and His Spirit ruling within—this is our conversion.

If it should be so with any one of you here this afternoon that those words of St. Remigius to the old Frankish king Clovis should be necessary; if you have been following what you should have renounced; if you have laid on one side what should have been your first care; then when the light of Christ shines within your heart, and His spirit (for no man can call Jesus the Lord but by the Holy Ghost) is calling within you, and you find that God at last has found you out—then " burn what hitherto thou hast adored, and adore what hitherto thou hast burned," or spurned, or thought of no account. It is the most costly of all acts, but the gift and the inheritance are beyond price.

H. P. Bull.

II.—PRAYER

It is quite natural that following upon the subject of conversion we should next be invited to consider the subject of prayer. For conversion is not so much a sudden isolated phenomenon as a sustained attitude of soul towards God. It involves always a personal relationship between the soul and God; a relationship that finds expression in the most intimate converse of prayer. I propose in this paper to ask you to consider first of all what must be the background or foundation of our prayers, and then what are some of the characteristics of good prayer.

(1) Probably we are all at one in finding the regular practice of prayer an exceedingly difficult matter. When we find our prayers are being said badly, what do we do ? I suppose we try to improve them, if we do not give them up in despair. But often we fail in the very effort towards improvement because the effort does not go deep enough. Prayer is not an activity complete in itself. It cannot be isolated and dealt with apart from life; it is rather the energy of antecedent qualities of soul. It is the expression of our aim, the language of our faith, the voice of our desire. In other words, prayer is the outcome of right aiming, right thinking, and right wanting; and therefore for any solid worth in our prayers we must be growing in the proper dispositions of soul.

When we pray we direct our life Godwards. To pray is at once to lift up the heart and the mind to God, and to acknowledge His claim upon our life. To acknowledge God's claim upon

our life. If we get as far as doing this, then there is no reasonable position that can be held which stops short of acknowledging His claim to be absolute. And that leads us on to the conclusion that, His claim being so complete, the purpose of life can only be realized in Him.

When we have recognized this, and when we are trying, however feebly, to direct our life towards Him, we have penetrated to one of the secrets of good prayer; and our prayers become at once the expression of the aim of our life. If, then, we desire to pray well, let us first examine our aim. In what direction are we going? What is the object for which we are living? If we could reach to-day the object that most powerfully attracts our life, where should we find ourselves? Would God be our goal? "Ah!" we say, "that ideal is too high for ordinary folk." And yet no aim less than God Himself can satisfy the longing of the soul. We have been made for God, and have, therefore, been given the capacity for loving and possessing God; and there can be no peace of heart until this fact has been recognized and accepted. Here, then, is the supreme lesson of life: to acknowledge God as the only legitimate and worthy object of our existence; and in the learning of this lesson we get down to the true foundation of all prayer. Progress in prayer will then follow as a matter of course with perseverance and dependence on the grace of God.

Again, prayer is the language of faith. It follows that behind every prayer there is some thought of God, some belief in Him, some trust in His care.

It has often been pointed out that the nature of our prayer will be determined by the character of our thought about God. If we regard God as far away and remote from daily life, it is not likely that we shall think it worth while to pray at all. If we think of God as hard and exacting, our prayers will be cold and unloving. If, on the contrary, God is regarded as easy-going and indulgent, our prayers will be slack and careless. But if God is believed to be infinite love, then we shall at least try to make our prayers a response to His love. It is in our thoughts of God that we find the cause of much of our feebleness in prayer, for only too often our thoughts of God are dull, inadequate, lifeless. There is no hope in our prayers because there is no inspiration in our thoughts about God. It is a common evil to-day that many who call themselves Christians are lacking in vital religion. They are Christians rather through convention than by conviction. They have no grasp of the fundamentals of the Faith, or at any rate they do not appear to have learned either how to live or how to die in its power. The reason is not far to seek. They have never

assimilated the Faith. They have received it as a matter of course without penetrating into its wonders. They have never systematically given themselves to think about God and the great truths He has revealed. Here is a great need. Here is a clear call coming to us in the midst of our experience of life—a call to deeper, more serious, thought about God: a more sustained attention to Him in Himself, His nature, His character, His attributes. It is not enough to hear about God; we must work at our conception of God. We must try deliberately to think nobler, deeper, larger thoughts about Him; putting away from us what is false, mistaken, unworthy; learning more of the grandeur, the glory, the satisfying completeness of the truth. If we thus will feed the mind with what is true about God, our thoughts will be enriched by the splendour of His beauty, and our prayers will grow in worth and depth and insight.

Once more, prayer is the voice of desire. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." According to the desires of our heart, so will be the nature of our prayer. Now it is quite true that our Lord taught the disciples again and again to make petition to God concerning their needs. They were to ask Him for all they desired, and were to look confidently and trustfully to Him to answer them according to His Fatherly care and love. Consequently, learning our lesson from Him, we too are to open our hearts and show Him our desire and ask Him for all that is necessary for us, both for our souls and bodies. But if we limit our desire to the gifts, whether material or spiritual, which God has to give us, we have not yet discovered the secret of the Christian's noblest prayer. No doubt the desire for great gifts will inspire great prayers; yet if our desire is limited to such things it is only too probable that our prayers will grow less ardent in course of time if they do not die away altogether. One desire alone will inspire persistent prayer, as one desire alone will be worthy of our spiritual capacity; it is desire for God Himself. It is a great thing to ask God day by day to supply our wants, and trust Him simply to deal with us as with His children; but how much greater it is to want God Himself, for His own sake, supremely and uniquely, and to resolve to be satisfied with nothing short of Him! Can we find in our hearts a desire for God Himself, apart from His gifts? A desire inspired by our conviction that He is utterly lovely, infinitely lovable, the only satisfying object of our hearts' adoration? If we can find so great a treasure, we must indeed cherish it; for here is the secret of steadfast prayer, here is the promise of sure spiritual growth, here—we may even dare to say—is the first-fruits of that desire which will find its perfect satisfaction only in the Beatific Vision.

It is good that we should dwell upon this matter of desire for God, for the common lack of it is a serious defect in our character as a nation. The religion of an Englishman tends to be so subjective in its nature that it is frequently regarded as existing almost exclusively for his own benefit. Thus he prays in order to get God's gifts; he goes to Church if he likes the preaching; he practises religion if it brings him comfort. Consequently only too often he becomes self-centred in his idea of religion, and he thinks of God as a kindly Being Who is to minister to his wants. And when the difficult days come, when God seems to hide His Face, and prayer becomes drudgery, it is clear what will happen: the practice of religion will be abandoned. "My religion is no longer any help to me," we shall be told by way of explanation.

We thought just now about the aim of our life: now we are being led to think of our aim in our practice of religion. What is the lodestone of our hearts? Is it self, or is it God? Which thought comes most readily to our minds as we kneel to pray, "God is for me," or "I am for God"? If the former—if we, too, hold this subjective view of religion to which reference has been made, it is as if we were confined in a deep dark valley, where no view can be seen and little fresh air can penetrate. But if the latter—if, thinking little of ourselves, we look out from ourselves and find God to be the object of our hearts' desire—then we are set high above the valley upon a mountain track. Around us is the sweet air, on every side a boundless landscape, and before us, up and up into the limitless blue of the heavens, the Mount of Communion with God, where the All-Lovely is to be known, loved, and adored.

Prayer then is transformed; it is the eager voice of the soul thirsting for God Himself; it is the song of the pilgrim not to be turned aside from the object of his devotion; it is the call of the adventurer pressing on towards his quest. Let such thoughts bring us to the end of our present consideration of the foundation of prayer. I have suggested that prayer must be the expression of our aim, the language of our faith, the voice of our desire; and only as we care for the constituents of this foundation can we hope to pray better.

(2) Now we pass from the theoretical to the practical side of our subject as we consider some characteristics of good prayer.

The first must be reverence. Fundamentally, all kinds of prayer are alike. Prayer is always converse with God, and therefore it is always a matter of awe and wonder. It is, indeed, a marvellous thing that we tiny creatures should be encouraged to hold intimate communion with the infinitely Holy Creator. We know that the way of approach to Him has been prepared

by His own love, even through the shedding of the Blood of His Incarnate Son; and it is on account of no merit or worthiness of our own that we dare to set foot on that way. But as we follow it, let every step be marked with reverence. And let this reverence characterize all and every form of prayer: the saying of our grace as well as the reception of the Sacramental Gifts; the momentary prayer of ejaculation as well as the more formal devotion of ordered prayer. In a word, reverence must be the characteristic attitude of mind in all our approach to God; and it must be reflected and expressed in the attitude of the body at our times of prayer. It is to be hoped that we are all quite accustomed to the idea of praying to God in all kinds of places and at all kinds of times: but we shall agree, I expect, that the normal and most fitting attitude for most people is kneeling upon both knees. At the same time, it is well to bear in mind that standing is the attitude for prayer suggested by the drawings in the Catacombs, even as it is the characteristic attitude of the East. It is through attention to such a detail as this that we realize how close a connection there is between the soul and the body. The attitude of the body at times of prayer reacts upon the soul, so that when we are kneeling reverently, with our energies alert and ready for a great work, we are assisting the mind to concentrate and the heart to speak; while, if through slackness or carelessness, we lounge rather than kneel, and keep no guard over our eyes, we are preparing the way for every distraction. This suggests that, while we learn to pray at odd moments, walking about our business, sitting in a train, or lying on our beds, we shall be careful to kneel humbly and reverently in Church or at our devotions, and seek thus to assist the soul in its approach to God.

To reverence we must add sincerity. Our prayers must be our very own, rising up to God out of the heart of our being. Sometimes we make the mistake of using prayers that are not suitable for our nature and temperament. They may be good prayers in themselves, but if we know they do not express our truest desires and thoughts, let us by all means put them on one side and try another way. We must be our very own selves, utterly and absolutely frank and true, when we kneel to pray. All shams, insincerities, poses, must be laid aside and the soul in its nakedness must seek God Who is the very Truth. In saying this I do not mean to suggest that we may only pray according to the actual spiritual level that we have reached. There should always be room for aspiration in our prayers. There should be space for the energy of will which reaches out after the noblest virtues and chooses them, and seeks to bind them to the soul, even though at the moment such virtues are

far from being a part of the character. My point rather is that we dare not use high-flown language which voices no desire of the heart, or take upon our lips prayers expressing ideas or petitions that are wholly alien to our nature. Our prayers must be our very own: this must be their characteristic, whether we pray in the language of the masters of prayer, or speak to God with the natural spontaneity of our own hearts. This sincerity of prayer will involve continuous growth and development. We can never be satisfied to go on praying the prayers of our childhood after we have grown up, because at every moment of our life our prayers must be a true expression of ourselves as we are. This point should, on the face of it, be realized by all, and yet experience leads us to believe that there are a great number of people to-day who have never brought their prayers up to date, and who are still praying the prayers of their childhood. This can be illustrated by the case of Mundanus, which William Law gives as an example in his *Serious Call to a Devout Life*. "Mundanus," he writes, "is a man of excellent parts and clear apprehension. He is well advanced in age and has made a great figure in business. Every part of trade and business that has fallen in his way has had some improvement from him, and he is always contriving to carry any method of doing anything well to its greatest height. . . . The only one thing which has not fallen under his improvement, nor received any benefit from his judicious mind, is his devotion. This is in just the same poor state as it was when he was only six years of age, and the old man prays now in that little form of words which his mother used to hear him repeat night and morning. . . . If Mundanus sees a book of devotion, he passes it by as he would a spelling-book, because he remembers that he learnt to pray at his mother's knee." This example may suggest to us the great importance of revising our prayers from time to time. Are they up to date, alive, vigorous? When we kneel to pray, does our whole personality find expression? Do we, our very selves, move out to God in prayer?

This matter of sincerity leads on easily to another characteristic of good prayer, simplicity.

There is, I suppose, nothing in the world more beautiful than the loving intimacy of a mother and her child, who are entirely in sympathy with each other. As we watch them, there are many signs of intimacy that we can admire. For instance, we notice a complete absence of stiffness or restraint. This does not mean that the child is lacking in respect towards its mother, for its deep affection for her begets a reverence that adds an unfailing charm to their companionship. And the

outcome is a delightful simplicity and freedom of intercourse. The child treasures up and tells its mother all the interests, great and small, of every day; and obviously nothing delights the mother so much as to receive these confidences. Moreover, from time to time we gather hints that suggest that the use of words is not their only means of converse. Often at the end of the day they sit together by the fireside and are silent. There is no restraint even then. Indeed, least of all at such times does there seem to be any checking of the flow of their sympathy. Rather are we dimly conscious that in these silent moments their knowledge of each other grows deeper and richer, as if at such times each could penetrate deeper into the heart of the other. For the silence of these intimate moments is not a negative silence; it is not a mere ceasing from speech. It is creative, affirmative, positive; it is at once the expression of affection and the occasion for its enrichment.

It is possible that the consideration of such an ideal relationship between a mother and her child may help us towards our aim of simplicity in our converse with God. A characteristic part of the revelation of our Lord concerning God is that He is our Father; and our belief that He stands to us in this relationship must colour and control all our converse with Him. He is our God, therefore we must reverence Him; our Judge, therefore we must be sincere; our Father, and what follows? Without doubt that we must learn simplicity in our communion with Him. So let us hold converse with Him without any restraint, save that of loving reverence. It happens only too often that our prayers are dull and dreary and colourless even while our lives are full and rich with many interests. The reason is not far to seek. We have not learned freedom in our intercourse with God. We have forgotten that He is truly our Father. We have failed to bring Him in prayer the real life we are living, and are offering Him only a few conventional phrases. We must see to it that this failure is corrected. God must have our life at its fullest and richest, and we must consciously and deliberately offer Him its full flood. We must speak to Him of our deepest interests. All are honourable and worthy of a place in our prayers, provided always that they are good; and whether they are concerned with business or recreations or friendships they should be the substance of the truest and deepest offering of the confidences of our hearts. When thus we are trying to make our prayers living and interesting, it will come home to us how much more there is in prayer than the saying of words. We thought just now of the mother and the child sitting together in silence, and so growing in sympathy and intimacy. There is not one of us who would not wish to

develop such a relationship with our Heavenly Father. We wish we could be content to be quiet with God, and listen for His voice, and wait upon His will. How blessed to be able to believe that He is truly present, and in that belief to rise up to Him and love Him better! There are some who seem to have a natural capacity for such prayer as this. The late Father Congreve, of blessed memory, has given two illustrations of it from the lives of simple folk. He has told us of the old labourer who used to spend a long time at his devotions in church, and who replied to a question as to the subject of his prayers with the words: "I don't say much; I just looks at Him and He looks at me." And he has given us the story of the little girl recovering from an illness, who was often found praying by those who were nursing her. "What were you saying to God just now," she was asked, "as you lay still on your bed?" "I was not *speaking* to God," was her reply, "I was *loving* Him." But while some by a special favour of God are led naturally, as it seems to us, to this prayer of greatest simplicity, others can only come to it after much effort and many years of perseverance; while others, again, seem never to arrive at it at all. But we can at least be awake to the existence of these more intimate ways of prayer, and gain conviction of the great possibilities that stretch before us beyond the first elementary prayer of petition. Meanwhile, let us rest assured that God does not expect of us more than we can offer Him at any given moment, and that He accepts the humblest and feeblest movement towards Him as the hope of the ultimate perfection of intercourse.

Reverence, sincerity, simplicity: these will without doubt be characteristics of the prayer that has a true foundation. Yet by themselves they are not sufficient to ensure perseverance. As life goes on, it seems to many of us as if one supreme difficulty, one peculiar danger, threatens unceasingly the life of the soul. It is discouragement. The way of prayer can never be a way of smoothness nor of easy success. Often it must be a way of much darkness and difficulty and apparent failure; and those who are to endure to the end must have stout hearts and resolute wills. And so to the characteristics already suggested we add courage and patience—courage to meet the trials, the disappointments, the darkness, the drudgery to be encountered along the way; and patience to wait with hope for the light to shine, and to watch with faith for God's beckoning Hand.

There is in the Church to-day one supreme crying need. It is not the need of more organization, or of more committees, or of more conferences. The most pressing of all needs to-day is that of more prayer. Moreover, I dare to say that the holding

of this and similar Congresses will only have been worth while if they send us back to our homes determined to pray more fervently for the glory of God, for the sanctifying of our lives, for the conversion of this country and of all the world.

M. R. Carpenter-Garnier.

CHRIST AND SOCIETY

At the time of the French Revolution, when the delegates of the people came crowding into Paris, there was to be seen one unobtrusive little man, one Clootz, who was hailed with acclamation "representative of the human race." Standing here, the only non-clerical speaker, I find myself an equally insufficient representative of the human laity. To represent and to defend our laity is no light task; it is increasingly evident that in the great work which lies before the twentieth-century Church—the preaching and fulfilment of social righteousness—the priests have become the pioneers; the evasions and inadequacies which so sadly cumber our work arise very largely out of lay deficiency.

It was not always so; the Protestant and Erastian outlook tended to produce clergymen of the Archdeacon Grantley type, the unswerving ally of the squire and, later, the manufacturer; to-day, in vast numbers of towns and villages, it is the Catholic priest who, nourished on a sacramental philosophy, sees in the world the test of effort and the fruit of success.

He it is I speak of, the priest true to his great vocation, who asserts that perfect balance between service and freedom, between liberty and authority, between matter and spirit, which are the stigmata of the Catholic Faith. To reactionary, revolutionary, and apathetic alike he presents, in his lesson, a living criterion, encouragement and correction.

The priesthood cannot function in a void; for the full work of the Church the ungrudging support and activity of the laity is essential. Armed with conviction and sustained by the Blessed Sacrament, the two orders should stand out, like pope and emperor, writ small, as the spiritual and secular representatives of God in their parish.

Such is the ideal, but what are the facts? Our people have to withstand two attacks simultaneously delivered—no easy task for a terribly small garrison. On the one hand there is internal disaffection. Churchpeople, woefully ignorant of the full objective material significance of the Kingdom of God, of the secular implications of Incarnation, still tend to regard

religious devotion as a matter solely of personal pietism or even merely of decent conventional behaviour. Wider atomic Protestant tendencies, the embodiment of a society of God, including all men, in which the Will of God may be done in earth, has been forgotten. Many Churchpeople fail to see that the denial of opportunity and faculty to the people is a refusal to give to the Holy Spirit His full opportunity. To make the world the residence of the good, the beautiful, and the true—is this a fundamental ideal of the normal churchgoing citizen? Thus, within our own ranks, what in another place is called political action, the denunciation of avarice, usury and social injustice, is discouraged. If we are Catholics we must recover the whole Catholic practice, not only its ritual. The Catholic condemnation of avarice fully expressed would destroy the great mainspring of our present industrial society.

This is the attack by indifference and hostility from within; we come next to those who are without the fold. We must all have been perplexed at times by the notorious fact that so many reformers, doing, as we cannot but recognize, the work of God, feel no need apparently of the full Catholic Faith. Some are Quakers. The Friends, I am sure you will agree with me, have done more to heal the sorrows of Europe, more to befriend the orphan and succour the fatherless, than any other denomination. Some others say that they have no religion, yet they are doing the work of Christ, while, sad as it is to confess it, many within the Church are doing little or nothing. What is to be our answer to this very subtle opposition?

We believe that all those who would proceed to alter the world, whether by Socialism, Collectivism, Communism, Liberalism, or any other plan which does not base itself upon a change in the heart of man, must fail; and we believe that the heart of man can only be converted on that vast and all-inclusive scale which the Kingdom demands by the grace of our Lord, the intercession of the saints, and the operation of the Sacraments.

It is a matter of choice or inclination, rather than of reason and faith, whether Christian values are or are not acceptable to the secular reformer. Why do such people desire to be democrats? Why do they try to cure poverty and distress? Why do they believe in the equality of man? If these matters be considered from any standpoint other than the mystical one of faith, it is very evident that men are anything but equal in mind, body, or spirit. Science, efficiency, social history, and statistics, all show that the attempt to give to all men equal rights and wealth must lead to anarchy or the triumph of the politician. Eugenics, the conscious selection of race; divorce, the legal human dissolution of marriage—these cannot, I feel, be

convincingly opposed in a world imbued with a secular outlook on the grounds of expediency.

A social control of the poor, even for their compulsory physical betterment, would have satisfied the fine spirit of Plato.

There is but one answer to all these means of destroying human personality, one answer to the callous rich and the callous reformer alike: their methods are not the Lord's way. As between the traditional unsocial pietist on the one hand, and the progressive reformer without principle on the other, the Catholic Church must come as a reconciliation. The Church must gather up the subjective zeal of the one and the practical administrative gifts of the other in order to use both for the spreading of the Kingdom.

We are bound by our profession to work for Christ, and in working we achieve a criterion by which all secular proposals, political or economic, can be judged. Just because we have the truth, we should be the people who know where they are and whither they are tending. The world lacks, above all things, a standard; we believe that we are privileged, not only to possess that standard, but to be the standard-bearers also.

There are two types of society which wise men have thought admirable: the one a static stable state which, once adjusted, goes on for ever, where justice, not charity, is the leading characteristic. Such a society, I believe, is the ideal of most modern politicians—it is a pagan ideal.

The other state is the city of God; it is the state of peace and righteousness, of charity and love; the way of this is through effort and agony; it is a dynamic purposive changing society—the Christian state. Once only in the history of man has a real attempt been made to achieve it. There was once a society which, with all its crudities and inadequacies, preserved the central idea that human society existed to glorify God—the society which we call mediæval.

The great and glorious notion of a universal Christendom, guided by pope and emperor, the spiritual and secular representatives of God, was lost and the anarchic notion of separate national moralities and religions was substituted—a notion the futility of which is becoming more and more apparent every day.

So, after these many years of alleged progress, we Catholics are driven laboriously to endeavour to recover the lost values of the mediæval life. In methods of industry, in art, in politics, Catholics cannot but believe that the earlier method was the better way.

The religious life of the Middle Ages, we know, found ex-

pression in most beautiful buildings and craft of every kind. Believing in creation, we must necessarily see in Beauty one of the tests of the causation and reality of Perfection. We may make speeches—sometimes perhaps we do not quite mean what we say—we may persuade people that we are very pious—some such have ended in prison—but there is one thing a man cannot do if the root of the matter is not in him, he cannot produce a work of art.

Compare the sort of stuff this secular age produces and compare it with those great hymns of stone which still glorify their Creator. Progress, other than progress towards the Kingdom, is an illusion. Quantities of imports and exports, increased facility to cast vulgarity abroad by wireless electricity, increased power to shoot stockbrokers through tubes at enormous speeds; it is not in this way that the Will of God will be done. Society should not underrate such gifts as may come to us by discovery; but we are in great danger to-day of being diverted by the multiplicity of so-called conquests of nature from our real task. There is but one progress, as I have said, the progress to increase in the Holy Spirit more and more until we come to the everlasting Kingdom. The world is full of weariness, sorrow, and sin; people ask the question, "Why does God permit sin?" It is not God who allows sin, but we ourselves. We have the freedom to prevent it; our Lord has liberated us from the necessities of evil; only we must recognize that life is a corporate social adventure, to be achieved in co-operation, in service and in joy.

With hammer and with anvil,
  With masonry and hod,
We seek the grace wherewith to build
  A Kingdom for our God.

In sorrow and in torment,
  In grief for efforts vain,
With hope renewed we strive to make
  That Kingdom rise again.

Here, then, is loving service,
  Here sounds our certain call,
A heritage incarnate,
  A ministry of all.

HENRY H. SLESSER.

NOTICES

Die Werke des hl. Quodvultdeus, Bischofs von Karthago gestorben um 453. Von P. Dr. Desiderius Franses, O.F.M. (=*Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar Munchen, IV. Reihe, Nr.* 9). München, 1920. Pp. 90.

This study merits notice, though belated, as being almost the sole effort yet made to discuss seriously the genuineness of some of the pieces included in Dom Germain Morin's *S. Augustini . . . Sermones Inediti* (1917). Following up the suggestions made by Morin's paper, "Pour une future édition des opuscules de St. Quodvultdeus" in the *Revue Benedictine* (1914), the author endeavours to vindicate for Q some twelve pieces, adding the interesting Pseudo-Propper *de Promissionibus et Prædicationibus Dei*, and seven others. Of the twelve mentioned, nine are in Migne, P.L. 40 or 42 (Serm. II., III., IV., *de Symbolo ad Catechumenos; de Cantico Novo; de Ultima IV^a Feria; de Cataclysmo; de Tempore barbarico I.; adv. quinque Hæreses; contra Judæos, Paganos, et Arianos*); three are in Mai, *Nova Patr. Biblioth.*, I., 251-282 (*de accedentibus ad gratiam* I. and II., and *de Tempore barbarico* II.).

In pp. 1-52 Dr. Franses discusses the "Ueberlieferungs-und-Echtheits-Frage"; pp. 52-69 the value of Q's writings "für Bibelwissenschaft, Dogmengeschichte, Liturgik u. Geschichte"; pp. 69-77 "die ausserbiblischen Zitate bei Q"; pp. 78-79, a sketch of Q's life, while the remaining pages discuss the genuineness of seven other pieces, including three assigned to Q by Morin (*op. cit.*, Appendix).

The result of these assignations is to increase greatly our knowledge of Q's life and circumstances. Elected Bishop of Carthage in 437, he was banished after three busy and fruitful years, when Carthage was taken in October, 439. He found a shelter in Campania, where he wrote the *de Promissionibus* about the middle of the century, dying before 455, for in that year Deogratias was elected Bishop in his stead.

Practically all the works in question contain evidence pointing to the period when Q lived (*e.g., Temp. barb.* II. *init., inter tantas strages, ruinas, captiuitates et mortes*), and of this Franses makes good use. On the other hand, his linguistic discussions and parallels are poor and unconvincing, showing for one thing no great acquaintance with the language or style of Q's great teacher and model, St. Augustine, and employing as hall-marks of Q's manner words and phrases which he employs in common with Augustine and others. Such are: the interpretation of "David" as "manu fortis" (Hier., Aug., Cassiod., etc.); the jingling opposition of *falsitas* and *ueritas* (Augustinian: *e.g., Conf.* 4, 16, 29; *Serm.* 128, 1; 133, 5; *In Psalm* 147, 1; *Ep.* 141, 8; etc.); *ructo* (F., p. 89, *faucibus pietatis biberunt, ore interioris hominis ructauerunt*) is Augustinian (*Serm.* 68, 2, 3; 350, 1; 388, 2; *In Psalm* 103, *Serm.* 3, 4; *In Io. Eu.*, 36, 1; *In Ep. Io.*, 1, 8, etc.); *ducatum præbere* (F., p. 42) is Augustinian (*Serm.* 4, 5, 6; *Div. Dœm.*, 3, 7, etc.); *quiesco* with infinitive (F., pp. 19, 35, etc.) is Augustinian (*In Psalm* 99, 4; *Ep.* 111, 2, etc.), and not rare elsewhere.

Yet Q has his own peculiarities, and a careful study of these by the present writer makes him accept entirely Dom Morin's characterization of the works mentioned as emanating from the Augustinian circle and with the utmost probability to be assigned to Quodvultdeus. Franses

might have added for two of his sermons the testimony of P. Odilo Rottmanner in his *Geistesfrüchte*, p. 83, note 3. Since he has made no serious mention of other two factors towards proving his case, they may be suggested for the benefit of others interested: (1) The *De Promissionibus* contains, as is well known, a biblical text showing marked agreement with *h*. Do the other treatises show resemblances, or, if not, is there a sufficient reason? (2) The influence of Tyconius on this treatise was pointed out in Burkitt's *Rules of Tyconius*, p. xx. Q would more probably have his copy of T before leaving Africa, so do the other works in question reveal traces of him?

The study of this "reclaimed" author may be confidently recommended to some English student seeking an interesting and not too long piece of research. As F. shows (p. 3), manuscripts of several at least of the treatises are to be found in England. An edition of these would be most acceptable, and would not involve a great deal of time or trouble to a competent man. And the field is clear: Franses' thesis, interesting and useful as it is, is only a beginning, a rough sketch of what is required, and his work could easily be made the starting-point for a thorough and most profitable inquiry.

J. H. Baxter.

The Spiritual Gifts. By J. R. Pridie, M.A. Robert Scott, 1921. Pp. 160.

This is a very careful and timely inquiry "into the meaning and scope of some of the spiritual gifts" of which we read in the pages of the New Testament. It is thus only a partial investigation of that very wide and intricate subject suggested by the title of the book; for the author has selected only "those which have to do" not so much "with the organization as with the organism of the Church."* But this selection of necessity has led him to deal with the more difficult and obscure of its problems, such as prophesyings, speakings with tongues, and healings, and to pass over almost entirely the easier and more obvious, such as the administering of the Sacraments, preachings and teachings; and we are under a special debt to him for trying to elucidate these important but much disputed topics, and for doing so in a scholarly, methodical, and suggestive way throughout. If on some points the obscurity still largely remains, we must not be surprised nor complain, but rather be thankful to him for the help he has given us on those where, from the nature of the case, he has been more successful.

The distinction drawn above in general terms between the two kinds of gifts is one on which much stress is laid as a fundamental part of his argument, because of the author's conviction (which we should all share with him) that the Church "is from the first an organism rather than an organization," and as such "the law of its being is the expression of that Divine life," through the Spirit, "with which it is endowed and by which it lives," whereas "organization comes later as a necessary development for permanent activity";† though he is careful "not to imply that the one class of gifts is more or less 'spiritual' than the other. They all spring from the relation of the Church to the living Christ."‡

Confining himself, then, to that class of *χαρίσματα* which we have indicated, except when he is obliged to refer to the other, Mr. Pridie seeks to show—

* P. 12. † P. 11. ‡ P. 13

(1) That, since they "had their place," at least in germ, "among the natural gifts of humanity," yet the large "measure of the supernatural character so consistently ascribed to them in the Christian writings" was not so much "a definite new departure dating from" the first Pentecost after the Lord's Resurrection, as "a revelation from God through Christ of powers which were inherent in human nature, but were not clearly manifested nor adequately understood until they were revealed in perfect operation in the Person of the Redeemer—perfect man as well as perfect God."*

(2) That the power to exercise the diversities of gifts (often called δυνάμεις) belonged to the whole Body of the Church in common, and "if it was manifested in a special degree in any particular member, it was always to be used under the control and direction (ἐξουσία) of the whole Body—expressed through the local Church and for the good of its corporate life."† And this state of things lasted probably for at least two centuries. But (3) as time went on, dangers of misuse and imposture suggested the need of discipline, and the attempt was made to bring the extraordinary gifts (such as prophesyings, tongues, and healings) into line with the more ordinary and "within the circle of organization by the creation of special 'orders,' such as exorcists, who alone would now have official sanction for the exercise of those gifts, with the result that they would first cease to be regarded as part of the corporate possession of the whole Church . . . and would ere long pass out of use as part of the ordinary equipment of the Church in dealing with the spiritual problems with which she was faced."‡

So far Mr. Pridie's account of what happened in the first three centuries with regard to the χαρίσματα would be generally accepted as a very reasonable and probable one. But the real interest of his essay consists in two further points which he seeks to make, and, as we think, with much force and persuasiveness, though the first of them at least is against the expressed opinion of the generality of writers hitherto. Here, again, we still as much as possible let him express himself in his own words.

(1) The first is this, that whereas "with this cessation there grew up the theory that the gifts were only granted to the first Christians as means of convincing an unwilling and incredulous world of the truth of their mission,"§ yet as a matter of fact, rightly viewed, there was no limit of time assigned by Christ the Head to the full exercise of the power which Faith through the Spirit can wield for the overcoming of evil in the world: we are not "entitled to acquiesce in the view that the Holy Spirit has withdrawn those great evidences of His presence . . . we must find some way to knit up again the seamless garment of the Christ that it may become again the vesture which clothes a living Presence and a living Power."‖ That this is undoubtedly true with regard to such striking developments (under proper control) of late years as the ministration of spiritual healing¶ no reasonable and devout person can doubt, but it is a little difficult to see how it can be practically applied to γένη γλωσσῶν, ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν and διακρίσεις πνευμάτων—at all events, until we are more clear and certain than we are at present of the exact nature of such spiritual activities in St. Paul's day.

* P. 14. *Cf.* Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, 1897, p. 153 f., whose language, however, is more guarded and less definite.

† Pp. 15 f. ‡ P. 20 (see also p. 35). § P. 80. ‖ P. 67.

¶ What is said—*e.g.*, on pp. 130 ff.—on this matter should be noted.

(2) The second point follows close upon the first, and is a valuable contribution to the solution of the problem of reunion—viz., this: "There are evidences to-day of the reawakening of the corporate sense in many directions of human activity, and not least in the life of the Church. It is along such lines" (as have been indicated) "that we may work for the recovery of her ancient gifts and power . . . the new hopes and desires of to-day are due to the promptings of that Spirit of Power who waits still for the faith of men in order that He may reveal Himself to the world. It is not in the federation of Christian organizations agreed on some matters but differing on others that this . . . will come, but in the realization of that living organism which . . . is able . . . to become the channel of power . . . which has its origin . . . in the purposes and love of God." How far Mr. Pridie has succeeded in establishing the probability of this hopeful result must be left to those who study his book.

There are a good many misprints, especially in the matter of Greek accents. A full list of these cannot be given, but some of the more important corrections are these: p. 19, n. 1., for *Hac* read *Hæc;* p. 28, "*with* His attitude" should, I think, be "*as showing* His attitude"; p. 45, for *sermonorum* read *sermonum;* p. 53, for "obverse" I read "object"; p. 71, for *Chriesto* read *Chresto;* p. 77, for *sodalium* . . . *sodalia* read *sodalicium* . . . *sodalicia;* p. 84, for "lighteneth" read "lighteth"; p. 137, for "take" read "make."

C. L. Feltoe.

The Priory and Manor of Lynchmere and Shulbrede, being Records of Shulbrede Priory, the Village of Lynchmere, and the Surrounding Neighbourhood. By Arthur Ponsonby, with illustrations by the author. Taunton: Barnicott and Pearce, the Wessex Press. 1920.

The 'prentice hand of the amateur often sets to work to build up a history of his parish with little material, and usually produces a poor and worthless structure. But this book is of an entirely different nature. For seventeen years, the author tells us, he has been collecting the fragments of information which go to make up this book. He has searched diligently among ancient records, episcopal registers, rolls, and archæological collections, and has his reward in rescuing from historical obscurity the story of the house of which he is the fortunate possessor. Shulbrede Priory was founded in the reign of Richard I. by Sir Ralph de Arderne for Canons Regular of the Order of St. Augustine. Lynchmere is an adjoining village that was inhabited by the employees of the Priory. It is situate in northern Sussex, south of Haslemere and Hindhead, and retains its secluded nature. Mr. Ponsonby tells all about its church and neighbourhood, but chiefly does he lovingly record the story of the Priory in which he lives. A considerable part of the house remains, including some rather famous and curious wall-paintings, arcading of cloisters, refectory, undercroft with prior's chambers, slype, and cellarage. The chapel, chapter-house, and cloisters have fallen victims to iconoclasts, and the story of its dissolution shows the usual tales and libels on the monks for immorality and "wyckedness." The Priory remains a most interesting house and a charming residence for one who, like the author, appreciates its history. It has been inhabited for 720 years. For 350 years it was a priory and for the same number of years a farmhouse,

and then a happy fate befell it. It passed into the possession of the present owner, who has told its story so completely and so well. Beside being an author he is an artist also, and his drawings form admirable illustrations for the book.

The Interior Life. Edited by the Very Rev. J. Tissot. Burns and Oates. Second Edition. 1916.

With English people generally we share in a distrust of a too rigid systematizing of the spiritual life. Being that which is supremely alive, it escapes and transcends analysis; being intensely individual, it appears to refuse reduction to a general type. The mystic, we say, can only give us *points de repère;* his experience is only valid for himself. Yet this cannot be the whole truth. An older generation of spiritual writers recognized that we all share at least one factor in common, the human mind, the validity of whose findings depends ultimately upon the means thereto being common to all. And since we are indissolubly a living unity of soul and body, we have here a progressively solid foundation upon which to build up a science of the highest and most complete expression of our being, and a clue to the understanding of the end to which we are individually created. Hence the insistence of the priority of the reason in the human economy on the part of those writers who follow the scholastic method, of whom is the writer of this treatise on the interior life.

The book has come forth from a hidden and secret place, for we do not even know the name of its writer. He is content to let it appear unnamed, since it bears the distinctive stamp of the society to which he belongs, that of the missionaries of St. Francis of Sales. Its lucidity and happy simplicity lead us to guess, even were we not told, that it is the work of a Frenchman; of one whose still, clear mind, stored with the dry light of the father of scholasticism, has given its best and long-cultivated yield; that here a generous nature has found the means of sharing its inmost secrets of the spiritual life. And this is the reward of generosity, since to all it is not given to be able to impart even what is clearest and most life-containing for themselves.

Let us begin by quoting the author's own summary: "The specific idea of Christianity is to be the union, unimpaired yet subordinate, of the human with the divine; man's salvation united with and subordinate to God's glory as the end; man's action united with and subordinate to God's action as the way; man's devotional exercises united with and subordinate to God's grace as the means. Such is Christianity." Under the headings of The End, The Way, and The Means, he finds the primary divisions of his exposition.

The essential end of all creation is primarily for God's own glory in the sanctification of His Name—His Name being the summing up of all His divine attributes. As an "end annexed" is individual sanctification in the Kingdom of God. While on our side we are to give glory to God, God on His side has promised happiness to us, beginning here and perfected in His unhidden presence. Such happiness and its essentials lead Him to treat of the false satisfaction in creatures, the word meaning in the writer's mouth all created things, material and spiritual, including grace, virtues, Sacraments, and the Church itself, all, in a word, that is not God Himself. The following of such counsel can only lead, through a

right use of the adjuncts and instruments of this life, to the "Summits," the "five degrees of piety" familiar to students of ascetic theology, which end in a perfect equilibrium between man's sanctification and God's glory. In passing it may be noted that the term "piety," which has so deteriorated in common speech, is here rehabilitated by the author with its true and noble meaning: the seeing, loving, and seeking of God's glory as the supreme end.

In the second division, The Way is quite simply the Will of God. His exposition, which is especially significant and characteristic in this connection, groups itself under the Will signified and the Will of good pleasure. The Will of God is one, but although His divine Majesty has but one and singular Will, it is manifested to men in two main ways. We are given the indications of His Will in the rules laid down and the barriers set up to confine, protect, and contain the vital activities. These we find in the commandments of the Church and in the evangelical counsels. By identifying ourselves with these, we are in harmony with the statical element in the supernatural life. But there is also God's Will working within us, inspiring and impelling, the dynamic element, to which we must give free acceptance, the Will of God's good pleasure. The concurrence of these two sides of God's Will traces out the path to be followed, if we will fulfil the essential end of creation.

And thirdly, since both the end and the way is known, there remains the means to walk in the way towards this end. The knowledge of the architect that plans the work, of the contractor who controls it, must be supplemented and completed by the skill of the workman who handles the tools. On God's side, the means is His Grace; on man's, the means are the practices of penance and the exercises of piety, which latter, we are reminded, are not piety, but only the means thereto.

The author's treatment of the special danger of the ascetical and mystical life, that of Quietism, is dealt with particularly in his exposition of the two Wills of God. Following St. Francis of Sales, he shows that the voluntary acceptance of the good pleasure of God, which is His will energizing in us, is a way to conformance with that Will that is swifter in operation than going to Him walking with the short steps of our own will, as we try to conform it to His. God can lead us by the hand, making us walk with Him, or He can carry us in the arms of His providence. In this latter method, there is indeed what may be called passive piety, and which overstressed can lead to Quietism, but which in reality must be a disposition of spiritual receptivity, the rest in God that fends off agitation and turbidity, a state of voluntary acceptance rather than of inertia or cessation of vital function. Just as Christianity demands a union in subordination of man's salvation with the divine glory as an end, so Quietism rules out the association of man's salvation and leaves only the end. Just also as Christianity demands the union in subordination of man's action with God's as the way, so Quietism would stroke out human activity and leave only the operation of divine activity. Finally, just as Christianity seeks for the union of man's spiritual exercises and means with divine grace, so Quietism would suppress or refuse to recognize the validity of man's part in grace, and wait passively for grace to perform the entire supernatural task. It is further pointed out that Naturalism touches the other extreme, as being the exaltation of the human at the expense of the divine. Such, then, is the dry outline of this work, the bones without the flesh. It may be said that there is nothing new in it.

From another point of view, it is but a substantial commentary on the Fundamental Principle of St. Ignatius. Yet in its inevitableness lies its force. The often-repeated terms of the Church's theology and worship, our daily bread, are given new meaning, as related to a perceived whole. It is as if we look down upon a shining and strong city, spread out in the completeness of its boundaries, whose wards and strongholds we know well enough, yet the plan of which has hitherto escaped us in its massive simplicity. But we of modern days fear simplicity—fear to believe that the eternal truth is within our grasp. The history of religious thought has shared to a peculiar degree in the exaggerations of opposing halves of the truth. A balanced whole seems to lack the vitality and novelty of newly emphasized aspects of the whole. We tend, too, to measure the value of spiritual truth by the difficulty of its apprehension, whereas the difficulty lies not primarily in the apprehension, but in the performance.

The book belongs spiritually to a school of devotional writing that, as it secures a footing, is working strongly towards a solider foundation for the hidden life of the soul, in the face of the peculiar difficulties of modern devotional developments in the Roman Communion—Fr. Roche's *Mysteries of the Mass in Reasoned Prayers*, and Fr. Bede Jarrett's *Meditations for Layfolk*, to quote two outstanding examples, the general note of which is a resolute return to the first principles of evangelical simplicity, which, as ever, is richest in its Catholic interpretation.

The Preface to *The Interior Life* resolves itself into a serious warning against the frothy sentimentality of modern day devotions—a warning that does not apply merely to those for whom it is primarily intended. Doubtless English religion needs to rectify its belief in the office of reason rather than to magnify it. We tend to use it wrongly than too little, and our sentimentality lies rather in the moral than in the intellectual sphere. Great things will come from the trained mind that holds a rational theory of existence, along with a firm and verifying belief in the supernatural, and great holiness from the burning desire for Christian Perfection wedded to a conviction of the power of Grace.

A. Oakley.

While Shepherds Watched. By Richard Avenerle Maher. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1917. 1 vol. Pp. 159. 7s. 6d. net.

The story of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ has appealed to the imagination of writers from the earliest days. This little book tells the story of the birth of the Messiah in the vivid language of a modern American novelist. It begins with a description of the coming of the Angel bearing the Word to Mary of Nazareth. A beautiful description follows of the Annunciation and of Mary's acceptance of her divine vocation. The visit to Elisabeth, the *Magnificat*, the journey to Bethlehem in the "days of the taxing," the stable-shelter and the manger-bed, the wondrous birth, are described with a reverence and devotion which are the characteristic marks of this charming volume. Two chapters—"The Daughters of Earth" and "The Sons of Men"—attempt a mystical interpretation of the Incarnation in terms of universal motherhood and of suffering, toil, and pain.

There are some who see in the story of Christmas only an allegorical description of the eternal truth that God is immanent in the world of men and affairs. Mr. Maher gives full value to this conception, but he

never fails to emphasize the historical foundation of the Christmas story, and never forgets the fact of the Divine Transcendence. To him the divine is not only immanent in creation, but also far above and beyond it, the object of the adoration of men and angels. He brings to his task a facile pen as well as a devout mind, and the result is altogether delightful. The book contains, moreover, a beautiful frontispiece in colour, and chapter headings by Mr. Charles R. Stevens, which add considerably to the reader's pleasure.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND THE NEW DAY. By Cleland Boyd McAfee. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1920. 1 vol. Pp. 74. 5s. net.

This book is not in itself a reconstruction of theology. It is a plea for such work, and contains a few suggestions as to the points which specially need restatement. The author throughout has had in mind the needs, not of technical theologians, but of the working clergy and thoughtful laymen, upon whose shoulders is laid the responsibility of evolving such an expression of eternal truth as shall commend itself to the minds of the present generation. The "New Day" upon which the world has entered is not entirely the result of the war. Before 1914 two great movements were afoot which have done much to bring about the conditions of life and thought at the present time. The tremendous dangers in the sphere of economic and social life, and the revolution in the world of thought brought about as much by the reaction against materialism as by the growth of democratic ideals, are facts which the experience of war has only accentuated. The new conditions make three demands upon theology: (1) There must be a real recognition of the democratic movement; (2) there must be willingness to submit everything to the test of experience; (3) there must be a readiness to furnish a working basis for the programme of the kingdom of God on earth. The problems connected with the nature of God have become more acute during the years of war. It is here that the theologian has a wide field for the work of restatement and reconstruction. The accomplishment of salvation is a question that bulks large in the minds of men to-day. What does the theologian mean by salvation? Here is another sphere for the work of restatement. The problems with which the theologian is faced are not entirely philosophical or metaphysical. In the sphere of practical life men are asking, "What is the Church?" and the answer to the question needs to be carefully answered by modern theologians. Mr. McAfee lays down three axioms which should be taken into consideration in attempting to define the nature of the Church: (1) The theory of the Church must be put in terms of vitality rather than of institution; (2) the theory of the Church must rest increasingly on its outgoing rather than its incoming life; (3) the theory of the Church needs to be stated in terms of unity instead of division.

It is probable that many theologians will quarrel with much that Mr. McAfee writes. But it must be borne in mind that his purpose in this book is not so much to set himself up as a reconstructionist as to challenge the present situation and to stimulate a reverent approach to the theological problems which press most acutely on the minds of men and women to-day.

BOOK NOTES

The Christian Faith: Essays for the Use of Parents and Teachers. Written at the instance of the Christian Evidence Society. Edited by C. F. Nolloth, D. Litt. John Murray. xxi + 256 pp. 7s. 6d.

A volume to which Mr. C. C. J. Webb, Professor Kennett, Dr. Percy Gardner, Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Canon Barnes, and Professor E. W. Watson, among others, contribute arouses high expectations. That these expectations are only in part fulfilled is due to the limitations of the scheme rather than to any lack of skill on the part of the writers. The whole field of Biblical research, apologetics, and philosophical, scientific, and ethical problems, is surveyed in these short chapters. The result is an interesting and reassuring book well worth reading as a summary showing where we are; but it is no more specially suited for parents and teachers than many another volume not labelled in this way.

What the Churches Stand For. H. Milford. 2s. 6d.

Seven lectures delivered at Blackheath in 1921 make up this interesting little book. Two out of the seven represent the Church of England, the rest Congregationalism, Methodism, the Friends, the Baptists, and Presbyterianism. The editor of THEOLOGY leads off with a lecture on the general Catholic position, followed by Mr. Clement Rogers, who, probably wisely, emphasizes the difference between the Church and Non-conformity. Of the others, Mr. Edward Grubb on the Quakers is most worth reading.

Mystics and Heretics in Italy at the End of the Middle Ages. By Emile Gebhart. Translated by E. M. Hulme. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

The author was born at Nancy in 1839, and after a distinguished career as historian and man of letters died in 1908. The book here presented to the English reader was published in 1890 at Paris under the title *L'Italie Mystique.* Thirty-two years later a translation appears. The book is a collection of essays on Joachim of Flora, Francis of Assisi, Frederic II., Frà Salimbene, Dante, and Italian art, and makes very interesting reading. The subject is difficult and technical, and students should be grateful for such a book as this as a guide to its intricacies.

Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse. By Sir William Whitla. John Murray. 15s.

Sir Isaac Newton, whose scientific work belongs to the ages, wrote a book on the interpretation of prophecy, to which he attached great importance, but which has always been looked upon as a curiosity rather than taken seriously. Sir William Whitla, a distinguished man of science and a devout Protestant of the traditionalist school, has reissued the book, prefixing some lectures of his own on modern unbelief, German criticism, and the interpretation of prophecy. Newton's work has a certain antiquarian interest, and his Editor's Preface is written with a moderation and good taste not always found in such books, but readers of this journal are not likely to be much interested in the controversy. Nor will they accept the guidance of a writer who scolds unbelieving critics for failing to see the immense importance of the full stops in the sacred record of Gen. i. 1-3.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER